

JPRS 71486

18 July 1978

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 8, MAY 1978

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

20000724 111

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

DHS QUALITY INSPECTED 4

170

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet journal articles displaying a copyright notice and included in this report are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Further reproduction of these copyrighted journal articles is prohibited without permission from the copyright agency of the Soviet Union.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 71486	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 8, May 1978		5. Report Date 18 July 1978	
7. Author(s)		6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		8. Performing Organization Repr. No.	
		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics			
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 171
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price PC A08

18 July 1978

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 8, May 1978

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Results of L. I. Brezhnev's Visit to the FRG.....	1
Interview With L. I. Brezhnev.....	3
L. I. Brezhnev's Speech on FRG Television.....	12
L. I. Brezhnev's Speeches at the 16 May 1978 Meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.....	16
In the Vanguard of Social Progress (F. Vaganov).....	21
North of Tyumen'.....	35
Orientation Toward End National Economic Results (O. Korolev).....	48
Fruitful Cooperation Among Sciences.....	62
For the Success of the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Monopoly Front (Kharilaos Florakis).....	75
Sergei Eisenstein (R. Yurenev).....	99
Democracy and Constitution of Two Worlds (Yu. Ageshin, E. Kuz'min).....	112
From 'Convergence' Theory to 'Planetary Consciousness;' Class Nature of Bourgeois Theory Evolution (V. Smolyanskiy).....	127

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Constructive Power of Liberated Labor (N. Kozhanov).....	139
Social Utopia and the Idea of Socialism (V. Ignatovskiy).....	151
United States in the Modern World (A. Mileykovskiy, V. Trukhanovskiy).....	158

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 8,
May 1978

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) : F. Vaganov, O. Korolev et al.

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : May 1978

Signed to press : 25 May 1978

Copies : 997,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist."
1978

RESULTS OF L. I. BREZHNEV'S VISIT TO THE FRG

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 3-4

[CPSU Central Committee Politbureau, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers Announcement]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Politbureau, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers approve entirely and fully the work done by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, in the course of his visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and the results of this politically important visit. The talks held with leading state and public personalities of the FRG covering a broad range of European and international problems and problems of bilateral relations, and the documents issued as a result of L. I. Brezhnev's visit represent a major step in the progress of detente, good neighborliness, and strengthening the peace.

The CPSU Central Committee politbureau, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers express their confidence that the joint declaration and agreement on the development and intensification of long-term cooperation between the USSR and the FRG in economics and industry will provide greater stability and scope to relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic and that they will contribute to the strengthening and intensification of the positive processes which were initiated in international relations particularly as a result of the conclusion of the 12 August 1970 USSR-FRG Treaty. This treaty retains its full basic importance to relations between the two countries. It was, and remains, one of the determining factors in insuring detente and strengthening European security.

The CPSU Central Committee politbureau, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers note with satisfaction that the reciprocal understanding of the fact that peace is the greatest value toward which the political actions of both countries, as well as the efforts of other states, must be oriented, was confirmed and codified with documents in the course of the visit.

The fruitful work done in the course of the visit was aimed at comprehensively contributing through specific effective efforts, to be made both unilaterally and bilaterally, as well as multilaterally, to intensify the process of detente, fully in accordance with the final act of the Helsinki Conference, to the utilization of all ways and means to put an end to the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, to limit armaments, and to implement specific measures in the field of disarmament. Achieving a real change for the better in this field would be consistent with the vital interests of all nations.

The CPSU Central Committee politbureau, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers ascribe great importance to the result of L. I. Brezhnev's visit as applied to the economic area. The broadening of trade, industrial, and technical cooperation between the USSR and the FRG, based on the concluded documents, will substantially strengthen the material foundations of detente and will contribute to the systematically stable and mutually profitable growth of good neighborly relations to the benefit of the peoples and the good of the working people of both countries. The respective Soviet organizations must do everything within their power to fill the mutually profitable agreement with a specific content. They must implement their obligations efficiently, promptly, and with initiative, promoting a considerable increase in trade and the implementation of joint large-scale projects. Naturally, in this area positive results could be achieved if the West German side acts similarly.

Having discussed the results of the visit, which took place in a spirit of mutual understanding, frankness, and growing trust, the Soviet leadership expresses its firm will to continue to act in this spirit, with the objective of upgrading further the quality and level of bilateral relations and to convert them into a factor of stability and good neighborly relations in Europe and in the entire international arena.

L. I. Brezhnev's visit to the FRG was a major international event and yet another considerable contribution to the implementation of the foreign political course charted by the 25th CPSU Congress and of the Leninist peaceful policy pursued by our party and state. It marks a stage in the development of political detente and the creation of prerequisites for extending it to the military area. The use of all the opportunities stemming from the results of the visit in terms of strengthening the peace and international security will require the further adamant efforts of both sides.

The Soviet people warmly support the results of the visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and highly value the tremendous work done by L. I. Brezhnev to insure the success of the visit. The visit met with the approval and gratitude of the progressive and peace-loving forces of the entire world.

5003

CSO: 1802

INTERVIEW WITH L. I. BREZHNEV

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 5-12

[L. I. Brezhnev's Answers to Questions Submitted by VORWERTS, German Social Democratic Party Weekly]

[Text] [Question] In connection with your visit to the FRG we would like to have your assessment of the present condition of relations between our two countries and the prospects for their future development.

[Answer] I believe that relations between our countries are developing successfully in several directions. In our view, they have good possibilities for the future providing, naturally, that they do not come against artificially erected obstacles.

In connection with your question I can not fail to recall the treaty concluded between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic in Moscow, in August 1970. What is behind is too tragic for both nations to allow us to underestimate the bold turn that was taken then.

The treaty became a major international event. It was one of the cornerstones of detente. It gave an impetus to a long awaited positive development. It was followed by a number of other, including multilateral, accords.

Much has been done since. The FRG concluded important treaties with Poland, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia. Relations between the USSR and the FRG assumed a qualitatively new nature. Cooperation became the norm. A certain trust in each other's word and in jointly signed documents developed. Meetings are being held between members of the government, and parliamentary, political, and public personalities. Numerous delegations have been exchanged. Cultural and tourist exchanges are being organized. Briefly, a great deal of experience in a variety of relations has been acquired.

Understandably, summit meetings have played, and continue to play a determining role in establishing and strengthening fruitful relations between the USSR and the FRG. On each occasion they bring something new and positive,

enabling us to untie tough knots and make decisions marking further progress. The great interest which is now shown in your country and elsewhere in our forthcoming talks in Bonn with President W. Scheel and Chancellor H. Schmidt is, therefore, not amazing. I shall be equally pleased to meet with President W. Brandt with whom, we jointly began to clear the way to good relations between the two countries.

Relations with the FRG are part of the varied, essentially worldwide relations maintained by the Soviet Union. However, they are a rather important part, for a great deal depends in the field of European affairs and on a broader one on the positions taken by our two countries and on their reciprocal understanding. The conditions of relations between the FRG and the USSR is a sensitive indicator of international detente and of peaceful coexistence in Europe and elsewhere.

Allow me to emphasize yet once again that the course toward good neighborly and mutually profitable relations with the Federal Republic is a basic long-term course charted by our party and state.

Could we say that there are no problems or difficulties whatever in USSR-FRG relations? No, naturally. Such problems exist, even though their nature may be different.

There is the objective side of the matter and, above all, the very fact that we live in countries with different social systems. This is the basis for many complexities in various realms of communications. However, we must learn to live in peace and cooperate, for there is no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence among states.

However, difficulties and obstacles of another kind exist as well. They are created by the purposeful activities of forces which are aggressive concerning socialism, and who yearn for the time of the cold war. It is precisely such forces that, using various fabricated pretexts, systematically promote anti-Soviet campaigns, provoke complications, attempt to interfere in our internal affairs, and try to urge on the arms race. The activities of such forces, quite influential in the FRG, hinder the smooth development of relations between our two countries and weaken the possibilities for our cooperation in international affairs.

We are convinced that in our time all problems of intergovernmental relations may be resolved by adopting a calm and thoughtful approach, and a willingness to understand our partner and avoid the heating of passions and aggravation of differences. Given the presence of good will on both sides one could look ahead optimistically.

[Question] It has been stated by some in the FRG that business relations with the USSR have already "reached their ceiling." What is your view on this matter?

[Answer] I think that this is not the case. Consider the dynamics of figures characterizing the growth of USSR-FRG trade. It is quite impressive. In 1977 this trade was 2.5 times higher compared with 1973 and 5.5 times higher compared with 1970. The FRG holds first place in our trade with the capitalist countries. We have concluded a number of mutually profitable agreements. This is well exemplified by the contract for supplying Soviet natural gas to the FRG in exchange for pipes. Its significance is based not only on its scale but its long-term validity--extending to the year 2,000. In a way this symbolizes the mutual aspiration toward stability and durability of economic relations between the two countries.

West German companies are participating in the construction of the Oskol' Electrometallurgical Combine, biggest of its kind in the world, and in the construction of the Sheremet'yevo Airport. I recently visited the area of the Baykal-Amur Main Line--this real "construction project of the century." There trucks purchased from the FRG are doing good work. Many of your citizens have liked the Lada passenger car made by the Volga Plant. Many such examples could be cited.

However, it would not be true to say that we are fully satisfied with the condition of economic relations with your country. Not everything and always relations between FRG companies and our organizations develop as we would like them to. We are aware of this and, for our part, try to take the necessary measures promptly. We hope that the Federal Republic as well will make its contribution to the surmounting of existing difficulties. For example, we are waiting, finally, for the elimination of restrictions imposed on the importation of Soviet goods and for the creation of a more favorable customs duty system.

I have already had the occasion to mention that, in some respects, the economies of our two countries could be reciprocally supplementary. The intensifying international division of labor opens great possibilities to all countries. It is a tremendous opportunity for the steady growth of our economic relations as well, meeting our reciprocal interests. Furthermore, we do not have to limit ourselves to already existing forms of economic relations. We could look for new ways and display initiative, naturally, based on sober assessments and the principle of reciprocal advantage.

Soviet exports to the FRG account for 0.09 percent of the overall social product of the USSR. Yet, the share of West German exports to the USSR accounts for 0.6 percent of the FRG's gross social product. Therefore, we can not agree in the least to the statement that "a ceiling has been reached" in business relations between our two countries.

[Question] What possibilities do you see for the adoption of specific steps toward further detente in Europe?

[Answer] Further detente in Europe largely depends on the solution of ripe and urgent problems of military detente. We could even say that we have reached a level at which the process of political detente must merge with

that of military detente. That is why the most important thing now is to adopt practical measures for the reduction and control of the arms race.

As we know, the Soviet Union has formulated an entire platform of measures related to military detente. This includes rejecting a first nuclear strike, the non-expansion of existing military groups, and restricting the size of forces participating in exercises.

Naturally, we should not forget even for a minute the political aspects of the matter. The European climate favoring military detente is based on the all-round development of mutual relations among countries, strengthening the trust among their leaders, respect for concluded agreements, and systematic implementation of the Helsinki agreements.

Many Westerners favorably welcomed our proposals on holding all-European congresses on problems of cooperation in the fields of environmental protection, transportation, and power engineering. The possibility to act seemed likely. Unfortunately, however, here again our Western partners are being slow and inconsistent.

Something else. We are in favor of not letting West Berlin remain a blank spot on the chart of European detente. We still frequently come across attempts to bypass the quadripartite agreement. Acts have been committed showing a factual unwillingness to take into consideration the fact that that city is not part of the FRG. All this clashes with the spirit of detente and complicates international circumstances. This is our only possible assessment.

Therefore, the factors determining the fate of detente are numerous. Let us hope that only those among them which contribute to its intensification will be operative.

[Question] There is--and not in the FRG alone--concern that the Soviet Union is increasing its military potential quantitatively and qualitatively and systematically and consistently to an extent exceeding defense requirements. Do you too not believe that detente requires an agreement in the military area as well, based on balance?

[Answer] Allow me, above all, to mention the main thing: The concern you mentioned is totally groundless. There neither exists nor could exist a Soviet military threat to Europe or to any other part of the globe.

To begin with, let us turn to the purely factual side of the matter.

On the subject of Europe. Frequently the Western press and statements by some Western political and military leaders contain the assertion that the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact have created for themselves on the European continent a "military superiority" over NATO countries and are continuing increase their armed forces in Europe.

These are tendentious and misleading claims, to say the least.

Let me begin with the fact that for a number of years the Soviet Union has not been expanding or increasing its armed forces in Central Europe, i.e., in the area currently discussed in Vienna. Furthermore, both we and our allies are adamantly suggesting to the Western side to accept the direct obligation by both sides of not increasing their armed forces and armaments in Central Europe for the duration of the Vienna talks. Unfortunately, the Western countries have not accepted our proposal as yet. Their practical actions are following the opposite direction.

As to "superiority," at those same talks in Vienna the two sides exchanged official data clearly showing that no "superiority" or "disproportion" exists. Both the West and the Warsaw Pact members have in Central Europe military forces of approximately equal size--somewhere in the order of slightly over 980,000 men on each side.

Naturally, this balance does not represent total equality. Each side has its own structure of the armed forces. For example, missiles predominate in the composition of our land forces while missiles armed with nuclear warheads predominate in the airforces of the NATO bloc, and so on.

Let us add to all this that Western military and political leaders frequently repeat the assertion that, in their view, the West enjoys superiority in the quality of armaments. The question, therefore, is: After all this where is the logic in the claims of those same circles concerning an imaginary "threat from the East"?

All in all, and as a whole, in Europe, where the main forces of the two military-political groups confront each other, unquestionably military parity exists. The question is, need we maintain such parity at such a high level as it is now, or would it be possible to lower this level without disturbing the balance to anyone's advantage? We in the Soviet Union are firmly convinced that it could and should be lowered.

As to the global ratio of forces between the biggest members of the two military-political groups, i.e., the Soviet Union and the United States, as has been officially acknowledged by both sides, an approximate parity has been developed and maintained, i. e., a balance of strategic forces. It is precisely this parity that is the basis of the 1972 and the currently drafted Soviet-American agreement on limiting strategic offensive armaments.

Let me add that the overall size of the Soviet armed forces as well is no "military threat" to the West in the least, even though it is entirely adequate, should it become necessary, to deal a counter-strike against the aggressor, wherever he may be, in the West or in the East. Incidentally, this has been well understood and acknowledged by objective observers, including some in the American press.

Now as to our navy. Let me recall, above all, the simple fact that the Soviet Union has over 40,000 kilometers of sea borders. Considering the circumstance that the NATO countries have powerful offensive naval facilities, we must consider a corresponding defense in this area as well. We have created our ocean navy which is capable of carrying out such defense tasks. In terms of power this navy is not superior to the navy of the Western powers and, from the structural point of view, it is clearly defensive in nature. For example, it is no accident that we neither have nor are building strike aircraft carriers.

Yet another favorite topic of those who like to discuss the "Soviet military menace" is that of the civil defense measures taken by the USSR. It is incredible but a fact that specialists in anti-Soviet slander manage to interpret even such measures aimed at insuring the safety of the civilian population in the case of war as a sign of "aggressiveness": Allegedly the USSR is preparing a "first strike," hoping to avoid the response by hiding in shelters.

One must truly have a pathologically distorted imagination to be able to turn everything upside down! Could any normal person believe such fabrications?

We neither want nor are preparing for war. However, their own bitter experience has taught the Soviet people the tremendous casualties which the actions of an aggressor may cause among the population. Furthermore, all too frequently we hear views expressed by the other side on its readiness to inflict "powerful, destructive, preventive strikes," and so on, not to take any protective measures. Only notorious slanderers could consider this as preparations for attacking anyone.

The cold quantitative approach to the possibility of a nuclear war, popular in some countries, is alien to us--an approach according to which a certain percentage of civilian casualties is considered "acceptable." We are not happy in the least with predictions voiced in the West according to which "no more than 10 percent" of the population on earth would perish in the course of a worldwide nuclear war and that, allegedly, this is not so terrible, it is not the end of the world. We do not wish for anyone, for a single person, to be a part of this "10 percent."

As to the Soviet Union, I repeat, it is not thinking of "launching a first strike." On the contrary, our official proposal to all participants in the European conference, including the United States, of concluding an agreement not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against the other, is well known. Also known is the fact that the NATO countries are rejecting this proposal, letting it be understood quite clearly that they do not wish to abandon their plans for a first strike against our country. Therefore, who is threatening whom?

Such is the factual state of affairs.

Let us now turn to the political aspect of the matter.

The Soviet Union is indeed a powerful country, powerful politically, economically, and militarily. However, the Soviet Union is a peaceful country. Its peacefulness stems from the very nature of our society whose supreme objective, proclaimed through the laws and decisions of the highest political instances, is concern for the steady growth of the material prosperity and culture of the people. There is no problem we intend to resolve militarily. There is no single country toward which we may have territorial or any other claims fraught with the danger of a military conflict. Furthermore, the Soviet people--including the Soviet leadership--are quite well familiar, through personal experience, and remember what war today looks like. The people of the FRG belonging to the older generation can also remember the face of war and, possibly, they could understand better than, for example, the population of the United States, the great desire of the Soviet people to live in peace.

The principal "argument" in Western views on this famous "Soviet military threat" is ascribing the Soviet Union some kind of sinister intentions by virtue of its military capabilities. An example of such distortion is found in considerations regarding the number of hours which the Soviet army would need to reach the English Channel.

However, the Soviet Union does not have the least intention to attack any country west, east, north, or south. The Soviet Union does not intend in the least to "conquer" Western Europe. Our general staff is not working on a schedule for "reaching the English Channel." The frameworks of Soviet military construction are based on the limits of necessary defense. Yet, assessing USSR defense needs, we must also bear in mind the geographic location of our country. The true Soviet intentions are clearly laid out in official party and state documents. They could be judged also by the entire moral and political atmosphere in which the Soviet people live and are raised. The propaganda of militarization, appeals to prepare for war, and promoting mistrust of and hostility toward other nations are alien to this atmosphere.

The history of the Soviet state includes many examples of its love for peace. It eloquently speaks of the true reasons and sources of military threat. It mentions them, for we have had to pay serious attention to the country's defense problems. When in the initial days following the October Revolution our country called upon all belligerent countries to make peace, the Western countries answered us with collective hostile intervention. In the 1930's, when the USSR spoke out from a high international rostrum in favor of European collective security, it was answered by the Munich Accord and the Hitlerite aggression which followed it. After the defeat of the aggressor, when the Soviet Union undertook to rebuild the national economy wrecked by the war, the West launched a cold war against us and began to blackmail us with atomic weapons, apparently hoping that, weakened by the war, the USSR would obey foreign dictates. In our days, when the Soviet Union is formulating specific realistic and far-reaching proposals to restrain the arms race and promote disarmament, it is answered by the rattling of the neutron weapon.

Incidentally, anyone familiar with the history of the post-war years would easily remember that the arms race developed on the basis of the "action-counter-action" principle: The West hurled a challenge and the Soviet Union had to accept it. This has been the case from the first atom bomb to the present. Invariably each new round in the arms race has been accompanied by a new wave of lamentations on the subject of the "Soviet threat."

I would ask the readers of your newspaper to recall one more thing. It is not we but the United States that created tens of military bases with bombers and submarines equipped with nuclear and other long-range weapons, stringing a sinister chain along the borders of the USSR and of our allies, south, north, west, and east. I would suggest that those who today are sowing far-fetched fierce hysteria in connection with the natural defensive measures taken by the USSR, as well as those who believe such sowers of panic put themselves for a moment mentally in the position of the Soviet people. For several decades our country has been surrounded by such bases. It would be interesting to see what these nervous gentlemen would be saying under such circumstances?

However, the Soviet people have strong nerves. They have never panicked nor will they ever. They are merely taking the necessary measures to protect the country from any arising threat and are adamantly and systematically engaged in a struggle for a lasting peace, and for lowering the level of military confrontation above all in Europe.

Frankly speaking, it seems to me that those who are currently keeping up in the West a far-fetched campaign concerning the "Soviet military threat" are, in reality, thinking of something else. They are unwilling to tolerate the existing approximate balance in the ratio of military forces and would like to gain superiority. Yet, this in itself is dangerous, for such an approach would trigger a new unrestrained race in arms manufacturing and would be fraught with military adventures. The only thing for such people to realize, once and for all, would be that the Soviet Union has always found and, you may rest assured, will always find the proper answer to any military challenge.

For itself, the Soviet Union believes that approximate equality and parity are sufficient for the needs of defense. We do not set ourselves the objective of attaining military superiority. We also know that this very concept becomes meaningless in the presence of today's huge arsenals of already stockpiled nuclear weapons and delivery capabilities.

The Soviet Union firmly opposes the "balance of fear." We favor the balance of trust. That is precisely why we are so adamantly calling for the intensification of detente, and for raising the level and enriching the content of international cooperation, and for adamantly seeking an effective means for ending the arms race, to begin with, and, subsequently, for disarmament.

We are ready to sign any time in Vienna an agreement on lowering the level of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe by 5, 10, 20, or, if so desired, 50 percent. But let us do this honestly, so that the existing ratio of forces may not be disturbed, and so that no unilateral advantages would benefit one country to the detriment of another. Let us take the type of steps which would be realistic and acceptable to both sides as of now, and avoid attempts to use the talks to achieve one-sided military advantages.

Such is my answer to your question.

[Question] What personal expectations do you have concerning your visit, recalling your initial visit in 1973?

[Answer] I recall with satisfaction my first trip to the Federal Republic and my encounters and talks with state leaders, and representatives of parties, trade unions, and business circles.

I hope that on this occasion these favorable impressions will become even stronger and, above all, that we would be able to accomplish something useful and necessary to both nations and the cause of peace.

Allow me, in conclusion, to present my sincere greetings to the readers of your newspaper and give them and all citizens of the FRG my best wishes.

5003

CSO: 1802

L. I. BREZHNEV'S SPEECH ON FRG TELEVISION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 13-16

[Text] Good evening, dear television viewers!

I accepted with great pleasure the offer to talk with you today. My second visit to your country is ending. We are entirely satisfied with its results. Our talks with President Walter Scheel, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, and Vice-chancellor Genscher, and meetings with Willi Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, and with other state and political leaders of the FRG were quite necessary and useful.

In this trip to Bonn we considered it our task, on the basis of the 1970 Moscow Treaty, to formulate, together with the FRG leadership, the main guidelines of the future cooperation between our countries in bilateral affairs and earmark ways for interacting in strengthening the peace and detente. In my view, a great deal was achieved in this direction in the course of the visit. There are reasons to believe that its results will provide both greater stability and scope to relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union.

Currently we have reached a very important point in the development of world events. The Soviet Union and the FRG could do a great deal to eliminate the difficulties which the process of detente is encountering in its development. The strengthening and intensification of the positive processes which were initiated in international relations starting with the first half of the 1970's largely depend on our countries.

It is no secret that today such processes are being somewhat hindered. I shall not mention the numerous reasons for this. The main one, however, is that so far we have been unable to restrain the monstrous arms race. This is a very alarming circumstance, for such a race can not go on endlessly. It is mercilessly undermining the political detente structure. Unless stopped, it could question the very future of mankind.

For this reason, the Soviet Union, our country, considers that its most important objective in international affairs is to prevent the slipping of mankind into war and to defend and strengthen the peace--a universal, just,

and durable peace. Such is our inflexible course. It does not depend on any circumstantial currents. It has been legislatively codified in the constitution of the Soviet Union. We are steadfastly implementing this course by all possible means. It guides the work of Soviet diplomacy. It is supported by the entire public of our country. All our plans are oriented toward a peaceful future.

With every passing year an ever larger number of people, including FRG citizens, visit the Soviet Union. Any unprejudiced observer of our life would mandatorily assert that the entire atmosphere in our country is imbued with a most profound attachment of the people to peace and the aspiration to live in friendship with all nations.

When we say that we, the Soviet people, need peace, we are voicing what is in our hearts. I have travelled extensively around our country. Recently, for example, I visited once again Siberia and the Far East: I crossed thousands and thousands of kilometers and met with many people. No matter what was discussed, invariably the conversation turned to international problems as well. In the final account, it was reduced to the question of questions: Would it be possible to defend and strengthen the peace.

In our country, the Soviet Union, there are no classes, social strata, or professional groups interested in war or in preparations for war, hoping to profit from this. Naturally, we have more plants and an army. However, neither the managers of these plants nor the armies command personnel, nor the workers or soldiers base their prosperity on war or war supply orders. We would very much like, to the tremendous benefit of the entire society, to convert war plants to the production of peace-time goods, to peaceful and constructive purposes.

Our country is frequently compared to a huge construction site. This is a fact, not a metaphor. We are building a great deal. We are not simply building but, one could say, we are changing the very face of our country.

You have probably heard, for example, of the Baykal-Amur Main Line. This is a railroad over 3,000 kilometers long. It is being laid in permafrost, in the virgin Tayga and through rocks. Its completion would mean not simply to shorten greatly the distance to the Pacific but to develop a territory equalling in size several big countries. All this must be accomplished from just about scratch.

Or else, take the development of the Tyumen' petroleum deposits in Western Siberia. We began this tremendous project less than 15 years ago. Today it accounts for every second ton of Soviet petroleum extracted. Here, on the Ob' River, we are developing an area of approximately one million square kilometers.

Finally, there is the project of the real renaissance of our Russian Non-chernozem. It is a question of transforming, so to say, the age-old heart of Russia. Imagine: We have decided to create virtually from scratch

highly productive farming on an area equalling approximately the size of France. The entire project, including the draining and irrigation of huge areas, will be completed in its essential lines only by 1990. However, already by 1980 the area should account for one-sixth of the entire agricultural output of the Soviet Union.

Our undertakings and plans will take decades to accomplish. We are developing not one, not two, but tens of projects, each of which is bigger than the plans of entire countries. The end objective of each of them is to upgrade the prosperity of millions of people, of our entire nation.

We are resolving ever bigger and labor intensive problems in the social area as well. Let me cite the following example. For the first time we have entered in our constitution the right to housing. This right can not be simply proclaimed. Its exercise will require tremendous efforts. Every year 11 million of our people move into new premises. In our country rent for state-owned housing is exceptionall low. It was established 50 years ago and has not been raised since. All this means that society, the state, assumes an ever larger percentage of the housing costs. Here is another example. We have free and, probably, the most extensive health care system in the world. One-third of all physicians in the world are Soviet. However, in order to guarantee with maximum effectiveness the constitutional right of the citizens to health care further extensive capital investments, social measures, and scientific research will be needed. The number of such examples is very high.

All these are rather complex tasks. We have many complex problems and many shortcomings. However, we are resolving these problems with the help of the growing activeness and initiative of millions of citizens. We shall mandatorily resolve them with the only condition that a new world war be prevented and that a durable peace be secured on the reliable foundations of peaceful coexistence. In this light one could easily understand that the peaceful nature of our policy is not a grandstand but the very nature of our life. It is a guarantee for the firm and stable international course pursued by the USSR whose objectives, I believe, are clear, understood, and close to everyone: Peace, disarmament, and security of the nations.

The important specific proposals submitted by the Soviet Union in the international arena are subordinated precisely to these objectives. We are striving, to begin with, to at least begin by stopping the growth of armaments and armed forces of countries with a major military potential. This is the sense of our most recent initiatives.

Dear citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany!

The end of the first 10 days of May is a special time for our countries and peoples. Every year at this time we mark the end of World War Two in Europe. Naturally, we mark it differently, with quite different feelings. This is

understandable. However, there exist not only differences in feelings and views. There are common things too which, in my view, is today far more essential, far more important. Last war our peoples suffered tremendous and irreparable losses. Even though today new generations have grown up, and even though today, possibly, every second citizen of the USSR and the FRG is familiar with the war only from books, the past leads us to draw lessons from recent history, and reinforces the desire to live in peace and prevent a new tragedy.

We believe that it is time for responsible politicians of all countries without exception to tell one another and their peoples: There must be no war; they must say it and do everything possible so that indeed there may be no war. However, time is awasting: Every day lost, each hindrance and delay could be very costly to mankind, to all of us.

It was this, dear television viewers, that guided us in the course of the talks in Bonn. The documents which were signed there are of great importance.

Thus, the joint declaration signed by us and Chancellor H. Schmidt expresses the resolve of the parties to develop political cooperation between the FRG and the USSR on a solid and permanent basis. This applies both to bilateral affairs and major international problems, above all problems such as peaceful coexistence, detente, and restraining the arms race. An agreement was also signed calling for the extensive development of economic relations on a very long-range basis--to the end of our millenium. A solid material foundation is being laid for peaceful cooperation between our two countries.

These are good results. Now, from our view point, the task is for such agreements to be converted into factual actions, into real joint efforts in the international arena. Let us properly continue the historical project initiated with the conclusion of the 1970 Moscow Treaty. Let us develop and enrich the good traditions of cooperation for the sake of the interests of the peoples of both our countries and the further strengthening of the peace and development of fruitful cooperation in Europe and throughout the world!

Allow me, in conclusion, to thank warmly our hospitable hosts--Federal President Walter Scheel, Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, and all those with whom we met and talked, and all of you, residents of the FRG, for the warm reception and hospitality.

I wish you well! Good-bye!

5003
CSO: 1802

L. I. BREZHNEV'S SPEECHES AT THE 16 MAY 1978 MEETING OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDUM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 17-20

[Text] Opening the session, L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that an event of great historical significance had taken place in the life of our country. Constitutions were adopted embodying the rich experience of state construction, the further development of socialist democracy, and the great strength of the inviolable union of Soviet peoples.

Discussing then the results of the work on the preparation and adoption of the new constitutions of union republics, L. I. Brezhnev said:

We may consider that the objective formulated by the party, submitting the draft of these constitutions to nationwide discussion was attained. The participation of millions of Soviet people in such an important matter may be possible to refine and supplement the fundamental laws, enrich them by the people's experience, and take into consideration the characteristics of each republic.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention to some basically important circumstances.

First. As during the discussions of the draft constitution of the USSR, the Soviet people again gave priority to problems related to the responsibility of the citizen for his work and contribution to the common cause.

The Soviet people approving themselves in everything as exacting people who can not tolerate shortcomings, who react to them, who care for their work, as people to whom the fate of the fatherland is inseparable from their own. I felt this once again, particularly strongly, in the course of my trip to Siberia and the Far East.

Many noteworthy proposals were received in the course of the discussion of the constitutions' drafts. It is very important not to omit anything and gather absolutely everything that is useful and valuable, and take into

consideration as fully as possible in our practical work the wishes of the working people. This is not only the task of the republic and local organs but, naturally, of our central organs as well.

Second. The discussion was yet another vivid manifestation of the deep internationalism of our entire society.

The constitution of the USSR and the republic constitutions reasserted the fact that the friendship among the peoples is a truly priceless socialist gain, and a powerful motive force of our development.

Our party has always treated national characteristics with the necessary attention and respect. At the same time, in accordance with Lenin's legacy, it is adamantly raising the working people in a spirit of intolerance of national exclusivity and boastfulness.

The tempestuous development of the economy and culture of all our republics and all our socialist nations and nationalities, the very breath of life, one could say, lead each Soviet nation to the simple conclusion that the guarantee for its further prosperity lies in the fraternal cooperation among all Soviet people, the reciprocal enrichment of their national cultures, and the successful solution of nation and statewide problems of the entire great Soviet state. This is the basis of the inviolable unity of the Soviet people as a new historical community.

Thirdly, and finally. Close attention to problems of the development of local power organs was characteristic of the drafting and adoption of the republic constitutions.

The reason for such a detailed stipulation of the functions of local soviets in the constitutions is that it is above all through them that the national will is implemented and the population's requirements are taken into consideration.

A saying has already developed in our time: "People in the soviets are answerable to the people." All the stipulations of our constitutions concerning the soviets, who are indeed answerable for everything accomplished in the country, must be implemented particularly thoroughly. This is the direct duty of the state machinery workers. It is the prime concern of the party organs.

Comrades, as you obviously know, currently the draft constitutions of autonomous republics are being discussed. Their adoption, L. I. Brezhnev said in conclusion, will mark the end of the big and intensive work for the constitutional shaping of the social and state life of mature socialism, and for laying the foundations of the entire legislative system of the state of the whole people.

Speaking on the implementation of instructions by the USSR Council of Ministers, as stipulated by the laws of the 1978 state plan for economic and social development and USSR state budget, L. I. Brezhnev said:

I believe, comrades, that we are acting correctly by thoroughly discussing in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium problems related to the implementation of the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the laws it has passed, the implementation of the recommendations of the permanent commissions, and suggestions and remarks of the deputies.

Our practical experience is entirely based on the requirements of the constitution and the vital requirements of social development.

Summing up the discussion of the ratification of the convention banning military or any other type of hostile use of means for effecting the environment, concluded in Geneva on 18 May 1977, and submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers, L. I. Brezhnev pointed out the following:

The convention we are ratifying today is yet another specific step narrowing to a certain extent the realm of preparations for a new war. This step was initiated by the Soviet Union which is systematically implementing the peace program adopted at the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses.

The convention is also somehow the concentrated expression of one of the most important tasks of our time--the preservation of the planet with all its beauty and variety--for the people, so that it may serve the people in the future as well.

The Soviet Union is doing everything possible for the protection of nature and its vegetal and animal worlds and mineral resources. This is Lenin's legacy. His signature may be found under over 100 documents related to environmental protection, issued in the first years of the Soviet system. This course was reasserted by our party's 25th Congress. We shall continue to follow this line.

However, we are not alone on this planet and the protection of the environment will require the efforts of all people on earth. Wounding nature on one continent can not remain unnoticed on another. The more so if this wound has been inflicted deliberately, with malice aforethought, to the detriment of the people. Yet, unfortunately, possibilities to do this increase with scientific progress.

This convention affects all countries. It asserts the right of all nations to live on earth peacefully, and strengthens the hope that not only we, but our grandchildren and great grandchildren as well will be able to benefit from the bounties of nature--the natural foundations of the life of every person.

Ratifying this convention, we call upon all countries to join it. Environmental protection is a universal matter requiring the efforts of all mankind.

We are only a few days away from the opening of the special disarmament session of the United Nations General Assembly. The program to be submitted by the Soviet Union at the session is quite significant. Its purpose is the total cessation of the arms race--quantitative, and qualitative--and the creation of a real turn in resolving the problem of disarmament--the most important of all international problems.

The approval of this convention by the state precisely now is a step in this direction, even though limited in scope. Enacting the convention, it is as though its signatories emphasized that it would be thoughtless to reach the point at which new dangerous weapons of war and destruction show up in the arsenals of the different countries. This would cause tremendous harm, difficult to correct.

For this reason, allow me to end by recalling the need for the fastest possible solution of other ripe problems of limiting the arms race.

Characterizing the work of the newspapers IZVESTIYA SOVETOV NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR and the periodical SOVETY NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV, L. I. Brezhnev said:

Naturally, comrades, both IZVESTIYA and the periodical SOVETY are engaged in extensive and useful work. I have already had the occasion to mention this in connection with IZVESTIYA, when, two months ago, we awarded that newspaper the Order of the October Revolution. SOVETY NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV which, incidentally, was also recently given an award, is the IZVESTIYA journal and some of the statements made could be considered by personnel as applicable to them as well.

We, the party members, always consider an award a promisory note which must be paid with new accomplishments. Therefore, it would make sense to look today at the work of the newspaper and the periodical more exactly, more critically.

Obviously, each of the publications has its own main topic which determines its appearance, so to say. The topic of IZVESTIYA and SOVETY is the activities of the organs of the Soviet system in all their variety, and the work of those elected by the people themselves.

V. I. Lenin said that the Soviet system is a system open to all, doing everything in the eyes of the masses.

This means that our power organs are working on the basis of the principles of publicity, regularly informing the population of decisions made and results of their implementation. This also means that in all their activities the soviets rely on the multi-million strong citizens' aktiv and the support of the broad toiling masses.

It is precisely the implementation of this vivifying link between the soviets and the population that is one of the main functions of the press organs whose work we are discussing today.

The most important solutions of recent years, and the new constitution of the country open tremendous new opportunities to the soviets. Their work affects practically all realms of life of our people--economics, culture, living conditions, trade, public education, health care, public order, and, naturally, work. Therefore, the newspaper must present all these matters even more principle-mindedly. It must not only present them but do this as intelligibly as possible, finding a way to reach the hearts of millions of readers. It is then that it will be awaited by every home and family with real impatience. Naturally, the same applies to the periodical.

It is also very important for the readers to believe that everything that is proper and socially useful, whether it is a question of the development of a new initiative, an initiative by the people, or a critical article, will be supported by the newspaper. In this case they will truly consider the newspaper as their own.

That is why the question of the effectiveness of publications is so sharply raised today. Without it there could be no live, authoritative, and truly mass newspaper.

Finally, we must point out that IZVESTIYA remains a powerful instrument in the implementation of the peaceful Leninist foreign policy of our party and state and of the ideas of proletarian and socialist internationalism. However, this instrument will become even more effective if we upgrade its operativeness through the materials published, making them more striking and intelligible.

I believe that our present conversation and the decree we shall pass, L. I. Brezhnev noted in conclusion, will help the newspaper and the periodical in their further work.

5003

CSO: 1802

IN THE VANGUARD OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 21-32

[Article by F. Vaganov, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The 75th anniversary of the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party, which turned a new page in the history of the class struggle and the political organizations of the proletariat, is approaching. A basic struggle between two trends took place at the congress sessions which took place from 30 July to 23 August 1903, initially in Brussels and then in London: The revolutionary, headed by V. I. Lenin, and the opportunistic. As a result of the comprehensive and stormy discussion of the most important topical problems related to the study of the ways of development of capitalism, the revolutionary movement, and the creation and principles of the activities of the political party of the working class, the Leninist direction prevailed.

Assessing the universal-historical significance of the second RSDWP Congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that, "briefly stated, the outstanding role of this congress in the history of the great struggle for the victory of the revolution and socialism was determined by the fact that it was then that the Bolshevik Party--our great Leninist party--was founded."

The appearance of a Leninist party, a revolutionary Marxist party of a new type, radically changed the fate of our country and became the turning point of the Russian and worldwide liberation movement.

The appearance of a party of the most revolutionary class of the times--the proletariat--on the Russian political arena, a party which could head the transition to a new way of life, was a ripe objective need and the answer to problems of social development raised by reality itself. At that time world capitalism had entered its highest and final stage--imperialism. The capitalist system was torn by acute irreconcilable social contradictions, the main among which were the contradictions between labor and capital, the social nature of the production process and the private acquisition of its results, and poverty and privation on one hand and wealth and luxury, on the

other. These contradictions have reached a stage in which social conflicts inevitably grew into a highly intensive class struggle and when the objectively ripe proletarian revolution was being put on the agenda.

Exposing the socioeconomic nature of the imperialist stage of capitalism, Lenin reached the important theoretical conclusion that "... all this makes the level of development of capitalism now reached the era of a proletarian, a socialist revolution. This era has begun. A proletarian, a socialist revolution alone could lead mankind out of the dead-end created by imperialism and imperialist wars. Whatever the difficulties of the revolution and possible temporary failures or counter-revolutionary waves might be, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 32, p 140).

Russia was no particular exception to the worldwide social development, as bourgeois ideologues and revisionists claim. At the turn of the century, like the other countries, it had entered the imperialist stage of capitalism. "Russia's economic development as that of the rest of the world," Lenin pointed out, "progresses from serfdom to capitalism and, through large-scale machine capitalis, to socialism" ("Poln Sobe Soch," Vol 25, p 235).

At that time social conflicts in Russia had reached their breaking point. The Russian proletariat was confidently joining the revolutionary struggle against the rotten autocracy and bourgeois-landowning system. In the course of this struggle the proletariat was changing from a "class within itself" into a "class for itself," developing as the most progressive social force, as the leader of all working and exploited people in the struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system and the creation of a new, a socialist society.

At the beginning of the 20th Century the center of the world's revolutionary movement shifted to Russia. Russia was the link within the imperialist system on which all basic social contradictions of the epoch were focused with unparalleled force.

By virtue of the entire course of its historical development, Russia was moving into a leading position in the struggle for democracy and social progress. "History has now given us the immediate task," Lenin wrote, "which is the most revolutionary of all immediate tasks of the proletariat in any country. The implementation of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark not only of European but also ... Asian reaction would turn the Russian proletariat into the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 6, p 28).

Objective prerequisites alone were insufficient in enabling the Russian working class successfully to play this historical role. A political party had to be created, mastering a progressive theory and organizing and leading the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and all working people. Lenin's great merit at this turning point of social development was that he was the

first among the Marxists not only to see the urgent need for the Russian working class to have its own party but that he determined its historically most promising type as a superior form of the political organization of the proletariat, formulating, comprehensively substantiating, and resolving the problem of its creation. "We are faced with a most powerful enemy fortress which is heaping on us clouds of poison and bullets killing the best fighters," he wrote in 1900. "We must take this fortress and we shall take it if we combine all the forces of the awakening proletariat with all the forces of the Russian revolutionaries within a single party toward which anything that is alive and honest in Russia will gravitate" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 4, pp 376-377).

Lenin focused his entire genius and all his forces on explaining to the broad strata of the working class the need for the immediate organization of an independent political party. He proved that "a strictly organized revolutionary party will represent the biggest political force in contemporary Russia" (ibid, p 198). The establishment of the party, Lenin emphasized, was an exceptionally important matter whose solution would determine the destinies not only of the Russian but of the international workers movement.

Lenin developed in detail and brilliantly substantiated the plan for the building of a proletarian party of a new type as well as its programmatic, ideological, and organizational principles in a number of speeches and articles such as "The Vital Problem," "Our Immediate Task," "Our Program," and "What to Begin With?", in his book "What Is to Be Done?", and others. Emphasizing the historical significance of this project, Lenin wrote: "The proletariat has no weapon in the struggle for power other than organization. . . . The proletariat could and will inevitably become an invincible force only thanks to the fact that the ideological combination of its principles with Marxism will be consolidated through the material unity of an organization rallying millions of working people in the army of the working class. Neither the power of Russian autocracy falling into senility, nor the senile power of international capital would be able to resist such an army" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 8, pp 403-404).

The Petersburg "Alliance of the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" appeared in the 1890's. It was the embryo of a proletarian party. A first congress was held proclaiming the founding of the RSDWP. However, the creation of a party of a new type remained the topical task of the time. Lenin and his fellow workers did tremendous organizational work for the further rallying and unification of revolutionary forces and preparing all the necessary conditions for holding the second RSDWP Congress. It is precisely from this historical congress that the Bolshevik and Communist Party--the vanguard of the working class and all working people, and the party of the building of socialism and communism--that marks its beginning. "Bolshevism," Lenin pointed out, "has existed as a current of political thought and as a political party as of 1902" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 41, p 6).

By nature and historical vocation, the RSDWP, created at the second congress, was a party radically different from previously established social democratic parties. Its appearance was determined, above all, by the nature of the new historical epoch--the epoch of breakdown of the capitalist system, of proletarian revolutions, and of the revolutionary transition to the new socio-economic system--communism.

Appearing in the West in the second half of the 19th Century, the social democratic movement played a positive role in the organization and enlightenment of the proletariat, particularly in the initial period of its existence, influenced by K. Marx and F. Engels. By the turn of the 20th Century, however, the social democratic parties operating under circumstances of a relatively "peaceful" development of capitalism gradually began to consider as absolute parliamentary and other legal forms of struggle and reformist methods to the detriment of revolutionary methods. They openly began to revive Marxism and to adapt themselves to an ever greater extent to the capitalist system, becoming promoters of a bourgeois-conciliationist ideology within the labor movement.

Critically assessing the historical experience of the Western European social democratic parties, Lenin believed that, corroded by opportunism, and adapted only to the conditions of peaceful parliamentary activities, these parties could not meet the requirements of the new historical epoch. With the full power of a convinced Marxist revolutionary, he pointed out that "one must fearlessly go forth from the preparatory and legal organizations of the working class, trapped by opportunism, to revolutionary organizations of the proletariat, able not to limit themselves to legal means and to protect themselves from opportunistic betrayal, proletarian organizations joining the 'struggle for power,' the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 26, pp 255-256).

Under the new historical conditions, what should be the political party of the working class? Lenin comprehensively developed this question, thus making an invaluable contribution to Marxist theory. The party, he taught, is the progressive, organized, and conscientious segment of the working class, using the only true revolutionary dialectical-materialistic doctrine showing the laws and ways of social development in the contemporary epoch. The party is the highest form of the proletarian class organization, strong through its discipline and ideological and organizational unity. The party is the organizing and mobilizing force of the working class and all working people, and the guide of the revolutionary struggle. It has a scientific strategy and tactic for the making of a socialist revolution and for the seizure of political power by the proletariat and for the building of socialism. It never loses track of the end objectives of the movement and is systematically implementing the theory of scientific communism.

These qualities of the proletarian party of a new type were tested in the course of the grand struggle waged by the Russian and international proletariat in the course of the first decades of the 20th Century, in the course

of the establishment and consolidation of world socialism, and the successes of the world's revolutionary-liberation movement. Historical experience proved most convincingly the viability and accuracy of Lenin's theory of the party.

Bourgeois ideologues, reformists, and revisionists of all hues oppose this theory, proclaiming that, allegedly, it has become obsolete, that it reflects merely Russian specific conditions, and so on. Such pitiful attacks have been rebuffed by life itself. Unquestionably, the further course of the liberation struggle will totally reveal their reactionary nature and scientific groundlessness. Lenin's words describe with amazing aptness that which does not suit our party's critics: "Anyone who fights for everything, for total victory, must watch out for petty gains not to tie his hands or misdirect him or forget what is still relatively distant and without which all petty gains is merely vanity of vanities" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 10, p 197). It is precisely such a class far-sightedness and insurmountable communist purposefulness that the world bourgeoisie can not forgive our party.

The Bolshevik Party, the offspring of the Russian proletariat, was created on the firm theoretical base of Marxism-Leninism. It encompassed the best of the world's socialist movement. It arose as the truly revolutionary vanguard of the contemporary epoch--the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism.

With the development of the revolutionary activities of the Bolshevik Party Lenin's prophetic words delivered at the beginning of the 20th Century, ". . . give us an organization of revolutionaries and we shall transform Russia!" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 6, p 127) began to acquire a real meaning. "Everything that is alive and honest" in Russia gravitated toward the party. Its ranks grew and strengthened and its leading role in the revolutionary movement rose steadily. It organized and rallied the proletarian battalions and the toiling and exploited masses in the struggle against autocracy and capitalism.

The Bolshevik Party was the only one among all political parties in Russia which openly and directly expressed the basic interests of the working class and the working people of all nationalities. Surmounting all the hindrances and persecutions of Tsarist despotism, the Leninist party managed to become the inspirer and organizer of the decisive revolutionary struggle of the masses, giving the example of heroic service to the toiling people not only in words but in deeds.

The strength and ever growing role of the Leninist party lie in the fact that ever since its appearance it was the party of scientific socialism. The Bolsheviks had a theoretically elaborated program which contained a profound description of the capitalist system, its contradictions, its way of development, and its doom. It brought to light the objective inevitability of the socialist revolution and the advent of a new era--the era

of socialism and communism. The party adopted Marxism as its outlook--a science illuminating to the working class the path to its objective. " . . . Bolshevism," Lenin emphasized, "appeared in 1903 on the most solid base of Marxist theory" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 41, p 7).

The party was well familiar not only with the objectives of the revolutionary movement but with the means for their implementation. The profound Marxist analysis of the contemporary epoch enabled it clearly to imagine the deployment of class forces in social development.

Concretizing Marx's instructions, the party developed in accordance with the new conditions the question of the allies of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle. In the democratic stage of the struggle for the overthrow of the autocracy and the total elimination of serfdom, the entire peasantry was its natural ally. At the stage of the socialist revolution and the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the working class was allied to the poorest peasant strata and all exploited and oppressed masses of multinational Russia.

The party's strategy and tactic were a classical model of creative approach to the elaboration of ways and means of struggle in accordance with the variety and speed of development of the various movements, legal or clandestine, peaceful or violent, underground or open, and restricted or mass, as well as parliamentary and extra-parliamentary ways and means of revolutionary activities. The party did not lock itself within a national shell but always, as Lenin pointed out, "adopted particularly thirstily and successfully the respective 'last word' of American and European political experience" (ibid, p 8).

It was such a truly revolutionary proletarian party, which appeared in 1903, that truly changed Russia within a short segment of time in the factual and metaphorical sense of the word.

The first bourgeois-democratic revolution of the imperialist epoch in which the proletariat, headed by the Bolshevik Party, was the main motive force, broke out in 1905-1907. The revolution shook to its foundations the autocratic system even though it was unable to overthrow it entirely. This was a great school for revolutionary struggle, a dress rehearsal, without which, as Lenin pointed out, the socialist revolution of 1917 would have been impossible.

After the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution the party experienced the most difficult reactionary period during which it was forced to retreat. However, it retreated in an organized way, drawing lessons and learning further. Meanwhile, it adamantly prepared the masses for new social clashes with Tsarism and capitalism. During that dark period of raving obscurantism the Bolshevik Party was the only political party with a clear revolutionary orientation, deeply believing in the advent of a new upsurge of the mass revolutionary movement.

In February 1917 the working class and the toiling masses rose again to the attack of Tsarist autocracy. Tsarism was swept off during the second bourgeois-democratic revolution. This was a major success on the way to a socialist revolution.

In the course of the tempestuous revolutionary movement the Bolshevik Party grew into a major political force, proving itself as the leader and organizer of the multi-million strong masses. It was above all thanks to its efforts that the Russian proletariat became the leader of the toiling people in the struggle against Tsarism and capitalism.

Lenin's genius equipped the party with a battle program in the struggle for a socialist revolution. The eight months, from February to October 1917, were unparalleled in all previous history of the liberation movement, whether in Russia or in the rest of the world, in terms of the wealth of events, scale of mass actions, and scope of the work done by the Bolsheviks with a view to winning over on the side of the revolution the workers and the majority of the working people.

By that time prerequisites had developed in the country for a socialist revolution, both objective, i.e., socioeconomic as well as subjective, such as the existence of a revolutionary party, and a combat proletariat, trained in class battles, followed by the toiling masses. Proving the groundlessness and doctrinariness of Mensheviks and Essers, who believed, as do the contemporary bourgeois ideologues and revisionists, that Russia was not ripe for socialism, on the basis of a deep study of reality, precisely then Lenin repeatedly emphasized that "socialism will not create any uprising whatever unless the uprising is economically ripe," and that "now socialism is looking at us through the glasses of contemporary capitalism. Socialism is acquiring a practical outline," and that "it is impossible to go forth in 20th Century Russia which has acquired a republic and democracy through a revolutionary way without marching towards socialism . . ." ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 34, pp 192-193).

Under the leadership of the Leninist party, allied to the poorest peasant strata and the working people of all nationalities, for the first time in history the Russian working class made a victorious socialist revolution in October 1917, seized the power, and created the first state of workers and peasants in the world. " . . . At the time of the seizure of power and the creation of the Soviet Republic," Lenin pointed out, "Bolshevism was united. It drew to itself the best of similar socialist currents. It rallied around itself the entire vanguard of the proletariat and the tremendous majority of the working people" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 39, p 216).

This greatest socialist revolution of all opened the path to a new, previously unheard of socialist world. Its greatness was manifested above all in the fact that a huge breach was made in the wall of the capitalist system, which seemed impregnable strong, a break showing a widening tendency; from that moment on the omnipotence of capitalism began to be actually bogged down and the first stage of its general crisis occurred, a crisis which capitalism was never to be able to eliminate.

The proletarian revolution swept off the rule of the capitalist exploiters, giving the power to the workers and peasants. Social justice triumphed: A society of the majority of the people for the majority of the people was created, i.e., for all working people, for those who are the makers of history, the makers of material goods, and the creators of spiritual culture--the true bearers of a new, communist civilization. "Henceforth," Lenin said in October 1917, "Russian history has entered a new period and this third Russian revolution must, in its final account, lead to the victory of socialism" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 35, p 2).

The Great October Socialist Revolution opened a new era in the history of mankind--the era of transition from capitalism to socialism, and the era of the struggle for the liberation of the peoples from imperialism, of end to wars, of overthrowing the rule of capitalism, and of socialism.

Today the victory of the October Revolution has been acknowledged as the main event of the 20th Century, an event which radically changed the course of development of all mankind, an event under whose sign and influence profound revolutionary changes are taking place in the world. The Leninist party was the organizer and inspirer of universal-historical changes. Historical experience and the practice of social development proved the accuracy and viability of Engels' theoretical stipulation that "in order for the proletariat to be sufficiently strong at the decisive moment and be able to win, an idea which Marx and I defended in 1847, it must set up a separate party, separate from all other parties and opposing them, aware of being a class party" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 37, p 275).

The making of the Socialist Revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and seizure of the state power by the toiling masses were the first victory of the Leninist revolutionary vanguard, convincingly proving the tremendous possibilities which the working class and the toiling people have in achieving the social renovation of the world. "Today," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted at the ceremonious meeting on the 70th anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress, "looking back at that distant yet so close past, we can not but admire the accomplishments of Lenin and his fellow workers who created our party--the first party of a new type in history--and who led it through all hostile tempests and through the barricades of 1905 to February 1917, and from February 1917 to the victory of the Great October Revolution."

Following the seizure of power by the proletariat, as the leading and organizing force of the Soviet society, the Leninist party was faced with the full size of complex constructive tasks. For the first time in social practice socialism had to be converted from the possibility opened by Marxist-Leninist science to reality. This meant that the party had to lead the Soviet people down an unexplored path, in historically virgin lands. The task of building socialism and achieving radical socioeconomic and political changes was complicated by the fact that it was being implemented in a country had gone through a World and, subsequently, civil war and foreign intervention as a result of which its economy was disorganized and destroyed.

A complex and important examination had to be passed during that historical period. "The Russian proletariat has been given a great deal; nowhere else in the world has the working class been able to develop such revolutionary energy as in Russia. However, he who receives a great deal must give a great deal," Lenin wrote ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 31, p 177).

The Communist Party became the leader and organizer in the implementation of the great Leninist plan for building socialism. Its strength lay, above all, in the unbreakable and steadily strengthening ties with the masses, and in a policy which expressed the objective requirements of social development and the most vital interests of the working people, in the Marxist-Leninist theory which guided it, and in the fact that the party protected the unity and solidarity of its ranks, having mastered to perfection the art of the political leadership and organization of millions of working people.

All these qualities of the party were vividly manifested in the period of the struggle for socialism and for building a developed socialist society. As a result of the gigantic activities of the party, the working class, the main peasant masses, and the Soviet intelligentsia a socialist revolution, agricultural collectivization, and cultural revolution were made, and the national problem was resolved successfully. Within a relatively short historical period socialism won in our country. Mankind, as the CPSU program, passed at its 22nd Congress emphasizes, was given a factually existing socialist society and a practically tested science of building socialism. For the first time in history the Soviet people, headed by the Communist Party, laid the high road to the cherished goal of all working people--a society free from social and national oppression.

As the highest form of organization of social life today, socialism was triggered by the requirements of social progress and the objective need to develop the economy, science, and culture in the interest of the working people. The socialist society alone creates all the necessary conditions for the successful solution of the most complex and major problems of our time.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party the Soviet people accomplished a great exploit during the Patriotic War. It defended the socialist gains and, in the course of the combat alliance with the nations of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, saved European and world civilization from destruction by the fascist barbarians. Mankind will not forget this exploit of the first socialist country and the millions of its sons and daughters who gave their lives for peace and freedom.

In the post-war period, having rebuilt the national economy, under the party's leadership and through their selfless toil the Soviet people insured the rapid development of socialism on its own base and built the first developed socialist society in the world.

Contemporary Soviet society is characterized by its high dynamism, organic combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the new system, broadened scale and further socialization of output, its higher effectiveness and quality indicators, improved economic and social development planning and national economic management, improved political system, blossoming of socialist democracy, further elimination of major disparities between town and country and between mental and physical labor, increased social homogeneousness, rapprochement among classes and social groups with the increased leading role of the working class, and the increased leading role of the CPSU. The remarkable achievements of the Soviet system are reflected in the new USSR Constitution, justifiably described as the charter of developed socialism.

The developed socialist society is the highest accomplishment of modern social progress. It is the universal-historical accomplishment of the Leninist party and of the worldwide communist and workers' movements.

The 60 year long road covered by the Soviet state, whose leading force has been the Communist Party, is a road of great accomplishments and great revolutionary changes. No similar example may be found in history in terms of pace, scope, comprehensiveness, and results of such constructive work. This is vividly illustrated by irrefutable facts. Compared with the pre-revolutionary level, the 1977 national income was 68 times higher. Before the revolution, Russia accounted for slightly over four percent of the world's industrial output. Today 20 percent of this output is produced in the USSR. Today our industry produces in 2.5 days as much as was produced in the entire 1913. Whereas in the past agriculture was based on small individual underproductive peasant farms, today big collective socialist farms have been created and equipped with modern tools. Under the Soviet system the overall volume of agricultural output rose 4.5 times.

Major quality changes have taken place in the social structure of the Soviet society and in relations among the nations inhabiting our country; moral-political unity, friendship, international solidarity, loyalty, and dedication to communist ideals are the characteristic features of the new historical community which developed after the October Revolution--the Soviet people.

The Soviet Union has entirely eliminated social vices inherent in capitalism such as hunger, poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, social and national oppression, and an uncertain future. The material and cultural standards of the working people have risen. Compared with 1913, the real income of workers rose 10 times and that of peasants 14.7 times. Today every two years more housing is built than was available in the Russian cities on the eve of the Socialist Revolution.

Today the cultural wealth of the USSR belongs to the people and serves the education of the member of the communist epoch. The country's population is totally literate and over 75 percent of those employed in the

national economy are with higher or secondary (full and partial) education. The conversion to universal secondary education has been essentially completed. Literature, art, and science are inspired by the noble and lofty objectives of the building of communism.

At the present stage as well, continuing and developing its best traditions inherent in a proletarian party of a new type, the CPSU acts as a revolutionary, mobilizing, and guiding force. At its 24th and 25th congresses it formulated a great program for the further development of the country's economic potential, and for improving socialist social relations, socialist national statehood and democracy, socialist way of life, culture, and science.

Possessing the outstanding qualities of organizer and inspirer of the masses, the party led the entire multi-national Soviet people to the implementation of the historical tasks. The CPSU Central Committee and its politbureau, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the outstanding political leader of our time, loyal Marxist-Leninist, tireless fighter for the cause of communism and peace, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, are doing a tremendous amount of work.

The Communist Party covered the long and glorious historical path and has now become a powerful political force. The working people of our country have forever linked their destinies with it. This is clearly reflected, among others, in the figures characterizing the growth of the party ranks. In 1903, when the party was formed, it numbered about 3,500 members. On the eve of the storming of capitalism it had 350,000. Today the Leninist party has over 16 million of the best representatives of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and Soviet intelligentsia.

The party is successfully implementing its leading revolutionary role above all thanks to the fact that it tirelessly defends and develops the great Marxist-Leninist doctrine and, on this inviolable foundation, accurately reflects the basic interests of the Soviet people in the struggle for peace, democracy, socialism, and communism, proving its inflexible loyalty to the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism. The CPSU acts as a single, organized, and united force. Its entire internal life is built on the practically tested Marxist-Leninist organizational principles: Democratic centralism, collective leadership, and participation of all party members in the party's life and affairs.

Today the Soviet Union is in the vanguard of the world's social development. Its successes in the building of communism and the struggle for peace and social progress have a tremendously attractive force. They are an inspiring example to all toiling mankind. Lenin's words sound today as topical as 60 years ago: "The example of the socialist Soviet republic in Russia will be a living model to the peoples of all countries and the propaganda and revolutionizing effect of this model will be gigantic" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 35, p 250).

As is now obvious, the appearance of the Bolshevik Party had a decisive impact on the entire course of universal history.

The outstanding role of the Leninist party, the party of proletarian internationalists, was displayed particularly vividly in the international workers' movement. Its example was followed by the progressive revolutionary forces of practically all countries in the world. "The appearance of the Bolshevik Party," said Comrade M. A. Suslov in his speech on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress, "is an event of universal-historical significance which marked the beginning of a new stage in the development of the Russian and the world's labor movement and which initiated a radical turn on a international scale from the old social democratic parties to a proletarian party of a new type."

The creation of a proletarian party of a new type in Russia and the October Revolution made under its leadership laid the beginning of the organization of communist parties.

Lenin--the theoretician, organizer, and leader of the Bolshevik Party--was the initiator of the third, communist, International. This marked the transformation of the communist movement into a powerful worldwide political current and the irreversible involvement of the working class and toiling masses in the solution of the basic problems of our time.

Opening the First Comintern Congress, whose meetings took place in Moscow in March 1919, Lenin noted that the first international gathering of representatives of communist organizations "is of great universal-historical significance . . . The bourgeoisie is madly afraid of the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat . . . The international world revolution is beginning and intensifying . . . Victory is ours, the victory of a worldwide communist revolution is guaranteed" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 37, pp 489-490).

These were profoundly scientific concepts which expressed with extreme clarity the basic trends of the new epoch which was beginning--the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, indicating the universal-historical recognition of its revolutionary vanguard.

The ideological-theoretical and political foundations of the contemporary communist movement were laid with Lenin's direct participation. Its theory, strategy, and tactics and organizational-political principles governing the building of communist parties--parties of a new, Marxist-Leninist type--were elaborated. The historical experience of the Bolshevik Party and the principles governing its structure and functioning were the base for the founding of the first communist parties in other countries. "Bolshevism," Lenin wrote, "created the ideological and tactical foundations of the Third International, which was truly proletarian and communist, and which took into consideration the achievements of the peaceful epoch and the experience of the initiated revolutionary epoch. . . . Bolshevism provides a tactical model for all" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 37, pp 304-305).

The Communist International wrote great pages in the history of the development and strengthening of the world's communist movement. Providing all-round aid and attention to its sections--the communist parties in various countries--it rallied and inspired the revolutionary workers' movement in the struggle against capitalism. It taught communists loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist principles and the creative application of revolutionary theory in accordance with the overall laws and specific-historical and national characteristics. It strengthened proletarian class solidarity.

In the period following the dissolution of the Comintern the world's communist movement reached a new historical level. The communist and workers parties have become a major national and international political force possessing tremendous experience in leading the class struggle. Currently there are 90 communist and workers' parties in the world numbering nearly 60 million members. Today the international communist movement is the most progressive and influential political factor of our time.

The world's socialist revolution is a deep and lengthy process developing in individual countries as the necessary socioeconomic and political prerequisites ripe. It is not a one-time action launched by the working class of all countries but an entire revolutionary epoch--the contemporary epoch precisely--whose main and basic content is characterized by a universal-historical transition from capitalism to socialism under the leadership of the working class.

As a result of the development of the world's revolutionary process and the existence of objective and subjective factors of a revolutionary situation, between the end of the 1940's and the beginning of the 1950's socialist revolutions took place in a number of European and Asian countries and these countries dropped out of the capitalist system. A world socialist system was formed. Everywhere the communist and workers' parties were the initiators of the revolutionary changes and the establishment, development, and strengthening of socialism. Today the world socialist system has become a powerful socialist reality exerting a tremendous impact on the entire course of social development.

The proletariat in the socialist countries achieved considerable successes under the leadership of the communist and workers' parties. It gained tremendous prestige among the masses as a result of its selfless struggle against capitalism, monopoly domination, operation, and rightlessness. In the past 25 years its membership has risen by one-third. Strike activeness has risen sharply. Whereas in 1956 7.7 million workers participated in strikes, the number reached 60 million in 1976.

The national-liberation movement has entered a qualitatively new stage. The imperialist colonial system has been eliminated forever. Having rejected the yoke of colonialism, many countries took a progressive non-capitalist path of development and are choosing a socialist orientation.

All these tremendous social changes are occurring under the direct leadership and with the active participation of the Marxist-Leninist parties. The CPSU--a structural part of the international communist movement--is giving the example with the implementation of its international duty.

The CPSU is always concerned with the unity of the international communist movement based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. It ascribes great importance to strengthening its close ties with the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries. The indestructible combat alliance among communist and workers' parties and their unity of outlook, objectives, and will are the very base, the heart of cooperation among fraternal countries.

"The wind of the century," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "the wind of history is blowing the sails of the ship of socialism with its powerful breath. Our ship is irrepressibly going farther and farther toward the shining horizons of communism!"

Our party which, three-quarters of a century ago acted as a selfless revolutionary fighter for the radical reorganization of society, is continuing today its confident march, leading the people in the tried Leninist course of peace, democracy, and socialism.

5003

CSO: 1802

NORTH OF TYUMEN'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 33-42

[Article by TYUMENSKAYA PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST collective correspondent]

[Text] In his speech at the 18th Komsomol Congress, discussing the further development of the Tyumen' subsoil Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that the importance to the future of the homeland of this huge geographic area is growing with every passing day. "We shall live many years with the Tyumen' deposits," he said. "In the next 10 years we plan to achieve the main increase in the extraction of petroleum and gas and of the valuable chemical raw materials made of them precisely out of Tyumen'. In this connection, a new, more complex, stage of development of Western Siberia will take place, or, rather, has already taken place. The volume of all work in the area must be doubled and tripled. This will require new material and technical outlays and an influx of people."

Shortly before the congress, in the course of his trip in Siberia and the Far East, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev met in Tyumen' the oblast's party and economic leaders. In the course of his discussion with them he spoke of the need for the fuller and more effective utilization of existing resources and issued a number of specific instructions on the fulfillment of plans for the comprehensive development of the subsoil and the further development of production forces of the vast Tyumen' area. The party members and all working people in the oblast adopted Leonid Il'ich's advice and instructions as a battle program for action for the creation, in accordance with the party's decisions, of the biggest possible national economic complex of tremendous importance to the development of the country's economy.

Biographic Outline

Conventional measures do not apply to the Tyumen' national economic complex. Here life is being reshaped on huge areas which could easily cover France, the FRG, Italy, and Great Britain together.

The area's natural conditions are rugged. Swamps cover no less than 40 percent of the territory, or even over one-half of it in the petroleum extraction areas. The oblast has about 450,000 lakes. In spring the water level in the rivers rises by over 5 meters and the high water season may last up

to two months. Autumn floods occur as well. The following "detail" is related to such high water levels: Studies have indicated that from June to September there are up to 120 kilograms of blood sucking insects per hectare of water surface in the Surgut-Urengoy area.

Asked about their climate, Tyumen' northerners usually answer: "Twelve months of winter and the rest is summer." Here the lowest air temperature reaches -55 degrees while the average annual temperature is -3.5 degrees Centigrade.

It is worth recalling such climate characteristics, for the planning, supply, and other economic organs dealing with the Tyumen' national economic complex still include workers who do not fully take into consideration our specifics. Sometimes both deliveries of equipment for a project and its completion are planned for the same quarter. Or else, the norms of the central belt of the European part of the country are used in planning, freight for shipping to the far north may be delivered in the second half of the summer, or. . .

However rugged our area may be, according to the scientists, in terms of medical-biological characteristics, this huge territory is suitable for year-round living. In the summer vegetables and potatoes are cultivated in the open along the middle reaches of the Ob' River, where the main petroleum extraction is currently taking place.

The Soviet people approached the Tyumen' open spaces as careful protectors of nature. That is why the high water rivers, solid frosts, and vast forests have become their allies. The rivers are our most reliable roads. Furthermore, what kind of work would we do without a solid freeze? It is precisely in winter that pipelines are mainly laid out, electric power transmission lines built, timber shipped from felling areas, and freight supplied through "impassable" areas. The frost helps construction workers to build year-round roads, and oil drilling platforms on so-called "floating foundations." The peat workers lay dirt on the deeply frozen parts of shifting sands and reinforced concrete slabs are laid on the tracks. In the course of the short summer this "ice ridge" on which the drilling platform or road is laid cannot fall. The winter cold once again makes a capital repair of the equipment. Hundreds of millions of rubles are saved by using the frost!

Our oblast is justifiably considered rich. Its timber resources are bigger than those of Sweden and Finland together. Its numerous water bodies are richly stocked with fish providing up to 340,000 quintels of fish per year. Every year 85 to 90 million rubles' worth of fur from the forests and the Tundra or from game farms are sold the state.

Tyumenskaya Oblast has over four million hectares in farmland, including 1.7 million hectares of plowland. In the future, however, the arable area could be expanded by draining and developing floodlands and swamped territories. Every year about 1.7 million hectares are planted in grain crops, potatoes, vegetables, and fodder crops. The oblast's farms today raise 345,000 head of cows, 396,000 hogs, and 460,000 sheep. One-fifth of all domestic reindeer in the country graze on the lichen tundra pastures. Oil workers, geologists, timbermen, and construction workers are developing

their auxiliary plots. For example, greenhouse gardens cultivated by petroleum workers cover 70,000 square meters. The farms supply the population of northern cities and settlements with fresh cucumbers, tomatoes, fresh onions, eggs, milk and dairy products, and meat on a year-round basis.

Minerals take priority among the oblast resources. Specialists have estimated that all the elements of Mendeleev's table could be found in our area. For example, deposits of non-ferrous and rare metals, iron ores, and considerable reserves of lignite have been discovered in the oblast. The overall peat deposits exceed 60 billion tons. Geologists have discovered underground "seas" of mineral, iodine-bromium, and fresh water.

Petroleum, natural gas, and condensate are the most pricey Tyumen's deposits.

A Little History

The study of the geological structure of this part of the country was undertaken only after the Great October Revolution. In April 1918, in his "Outline of a Plan for Scientific and Technical Work," Lenin expressed his considerations on the rational location of production forces in the Russian Soviet Republic, which substantiated the need for the economic development of areas east of the Urals.

These Leninist instructions were further developed in the documents of party congresses and central committee plenums, and CPSU Central Committee and Soviet government decrees. In 1932 Academician I. M. Gubkin expressed his firm conviction that considerable oil deposits existed in Western Siberia. "Extraction in such areas," he wrote, "would meet not only the requirements of the Ural-Kuznetsk Combine but of the entire national economy of the USSR." At its 18th Congress the party issued the directive of insuring the development of geological prospecting and surveys in Siberia. However, the war prevented the implementation of these plans. Yet, the moment German fascism was defeated, the geologists resumed the storming of the Tyumen' underground.

It is worth recalling today that the idea that the Western Siberian depression was not oil bearing was not shared several decades ago even by some noted scientists, specialists, and economists. Frequently dramatic situations arose in the history of the Tyumen's national economic complex, threatening loss of time and stagnation. In 1953, for example, the Ministry of Petroleum Industry made the decision. . . to close down geological surveys in the northern latitudes. The implementation of this decision was already underway when, on 21 September that same year, a gas-water gushing occurred at the time the instruments were being removed from Well R-1 by the Berezovskaya Drilling Party. The power of the gushing hurled at a distance of 200 meters the five inch drill pipes and the drilling bit. The thunder of this gush by the small Vogulka River, at the edge of a settlement then known only from Surikov's painting "Menshikov in Berezovo," was heard

throughout the area. Nature itself had provided an answer to the question of whether or not to go on searching.

On 21 June 1960 Well R-6, drilled at the Shaimskiy Megaval yielded industrial oil. The discovery of the Trekhozernyy Oil Deposit, the first in Tyumenskaya Oblast, was made by seismic prospector V. A. Gershanik, geologist M. V. Shalavin, and drill foreman and now Hero of Socialist Labor S. N. Urusov.

In less than a year the Megionskoye Petroleum Deposit in the area of the middle reaches of the Ob' appeared on the map. The first well was drilled by a brigade headed by foreman G. I. Norkin from the Surgut Petroleum Prospecting Expedition, headed by F. K. Salmanov, subsequently named Hero of Socialist Labor, and Lenin Prize laureate. Geologists went further and further north, beyond the polar circle. On 27 September 1962 gas gushed out of the development well at the Tazovskiy Settlement at the 2,000 meter level...

This was followed by new "finds," one more significant than the other. Among them Urengoy shines as a first magnitude star. It was discovered in June 1966 by the drilling brigade headed by V. B. Polupanov.

The party and the people have rated highly the labor exploit of the pioneers. The RSFSR Main Geology Administration Tyumen' Territorial Geological Administration was awarded the Order of Lenin and, subsequently, the collective of Tyumen' geologists was awarded a second governmental award--the Labor Red Banner Order--for creating the West Siberian raw material base of the petroleum and gas extracting industry.

Skill Rather Than Number

Following the discovery of petroleum and gas deposits containing unparalleled wealth, the question arose of not limiting ourselves to the development of a petroleum and gas industry but undertaking the establishment of a powerful national economic complex and developing a base for the construction and construction materials industries, transportation, communications, agriculture, machine building, petrochemistry, and timber procurement and processing.

At the same time, tens of thousands of people coming from other parts of the country had to be placed and housed. Cadre training had to be organized on the spot. New settlements and cities had to be built. Public education, health, trade, public catering, and consumer and recreation facilities for the people had to be developed.

In the course of the radical reorganization of life, it was important to insure the steady blossoming of the northern ethnic groups: Khanty, Mansi, Nentsy, and Sel'kupi; the development of their age-old occupations had to

be assisted and people had to be extensively recruited to work in the petroleum, gas, and timber industries, and in construction and transportation.

The essence of the strategy and tactics for the tremendous work to be done purposefully, at a high pace, was based on the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees. Their main stipulation was to rely on science, and to use the achievements of scientific and technical progress and contemporary domestic and foreign experience in the development of the area.

A big group of production leaders, scientists, and specialists have been awarded the Lenin Prize at different times for scientifically substantiating oil and gas bearing possibilities of the West Siberian depression, the discovery of big petroleum and gas deposits, and the development and utilization of effective technical and economic solutions and progressive work methods which insured the accelerated development of these natural resources. Many innovators became USSR State Prize Laureates and were awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor. Thousands of workers have been awarded USSR orders and medals.

Specialists--geologists and petroleum workers--came to Tyumenskaya Oblast from other petroleum extraction parts of the country, above all the Ural-Volga. One of them was Yuriy Georgiyevich Erv'ye, whose name is linked with outstanding finds by Tyumen' geologists; one of the major organizers of the country's petroleum industry was Professor Viktor Ivanovich Muravlenko, Hero of Socialist Labor and Lenin and State Prize Laureate, who headed the Main Tyumen' Production Administration for the Petroleum and Gas Industry (Glavtyumennoftegaz) for nearly 12 years, from September 1965 to his last hour. Skilled cadres brought with themselves rich experience which made possible to study the development projects and begin extraction at the same time.'

However, under Tyumen' conditions previous experience could be used only creatively, taking the specific circumstances into consideration. One of the basic questions, at first, was the following: What deposits to develop first? The selection criterion, if one may use the term, was the payoff level. The biggest and highest density deposits, the "petroleum stores," which made considerable output possible, were chosen.

However, another question arose immediately: What was the best way to begin? For example, at that time the Ust'-Balykskaya and Megionskaya sites (the area of the middle reaches of the Ob' River) were only being studied. The decision was made to drill for oil in the most prepared sectors. Subsequently, they were organically included in the overall technological development plan. This method of priority development of the most advanced sectors is still being used comprehensively at the Tyumen's deposits, saving time and millions of rubles.

Great complexities developed in drilling at Samotlor, where three-quarters of the deposits are under takes and swamps; at the Ust'-Baiyskaya--where two-thirds of the deposits are under water; at the Teterevo-Mortym'inskaya--with 95 percent of the deposits under water, and so on. For that reason the directional well system was adopted. Whereas 12 years ago the share of such wells in the overall drilling was 16 percent it has now reached 95-98 percent. Five-ten or more wells began to be drilled from a small artificial platform, shifting the drilling within the limits of the platform. Further improvements on this method are being made. Everything new and progressive in drilling is being tried on geological exploratory drill holes.

Creatively using the experience acquired in the European part of the country, the Tyumen' oil drillers extensively used large-block derrick substructures and single installation systems. They standardized assemblies and organized their industrial manufacturing in the bases. They eliminated almost entirely welding operations, replacing them with quickly dismantable locally produced assemblies.

On 10 March 1967, for the first time in Siberia, the brigade headed by A. G. Timchenko moved over a distance of over four kilometers and assembled on a new spot a drilling system in seven hours! Somewhat later the method developed by Hero of Socialist Labor A. G. Timchenko and G. P. Yerevin was born. Through the joint forces of their drilling and derrick assembling brigades, they decided to build and assemble a drilling rig. Currently derrick assembly workers could set up a drilling installation in an average of slightly over four days.

In its decree "On the Extensive Dissemination of the Work Experience of Leading Drilling Brigades in the Petroleum Industry and Geological Prospecting Organizations," the CPSU Central Committee highly rated the work of the collectives drilling the Tyumen' subsoil.

Particular mention should be made of the movement of the Tyumen' drilling workers for the highest annual drilling per brigade. Working in two groups in five to seven teams the collective shortens the time of well drilling compared with the time required for preparatory and development work thus drastically increasing labor productivity.

In 1975, in Samotlor, the seven-team drilling brigade headed by RSFSR Supreme Soviet deputy chairman foreman G. M. Levin, drilled 114,000 meters of wells 2,100-2,200 meters deep. That year brigades headed by V. T. Gromov, G. P. Yerevin, and G. K. Petrov, working in six-seven team groups, drilled over 100,000 meters; the brigades headed by V. S. Glebov, V. V. Kitayev, A. D. Shakshin, and S. F. Yagafarov drilled 80,000 meters each.

The importance of this movement could be hardly overestimated. It enables a smaller number of skilled workers to drill more wells. However, many obsolete orders and instructions stand in the way of this useful experiment, according to which drilling collectives must develop the wells through their

own efforts and deliver them to the extraction workers instead of increasing further their drilling skills and developing and strengthening the development service. Obsolete orders and instructions should be made consistent with reality and the interests of the work, the sooner the better. This year alone the Tyumen' petroleum workers must drill nearly 5.1 million meters of wells!

We did not discuss drilling so extensively by accident. This is the very base of petroleum and gas extraction, for only wells open the way to underground deposits.

Yet, what is the best way to exploit these deposits? The people of Tyumen' made skillful use of the experience acquired in the Ural-Volga petroleum bearing area with some amendments. In order to maintain high pressure in the seams of the edge water flooding method proved to be the most effective. Water begins to be pumped into the seam practically with the beginning of the oil extraction. Currently over 99 percent of the petroleum is being extracted from deposits in which seam pressure is being artificially maintained.

However, the use of water affects the quality of the oil from which both liquids and salts must be removed. The Tyumen' oil workers achieve this only through deep dehydration without flushing the petroleum with fresh water. In this case over 90 percent of the water is pumped back into the seams.

The high pace of development of the Tyumen' deposits became possible thanks to the use of a number of technological and organizational solutions. The extraction of Tyumen' petroleum through conventional methods would have required double and triple outlays compared with other areas and, above all, a number of years would have been spent in setting up the machinery.

The establishment and development of the Tyumen' complex was a project involving many economic sectors, tens of ministries and departments, and hundreds of scientific research and design institutes, plants, and factories. Miners, metallurgical workers, railroad men, chemists, machine builders, fliers, power workers, river navigators, trade workers, cultural workers, and members of many other professions are dedicating their hearts and souls to this work.

Party members were sent to Tyumen' by the party organizations of Moscow, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Azerbadzhan, Tatariya, Bashkeriya, and Kuybyshevskaya, Sverdlovskaya, Omskaya, Novosibirskaya, and many other oblasts and krays. Following their example, non-party workers and specialists--entire collectives with their families--came to us.

The process of organizing, shaping, and training the labor collectives was, and remains, the most important link in the party's management of the economy. Today the entire country knows the twice order bearer collective of

Tyumen' geologists. Orders of Lenin have been awarded to Glavtyumenneftegaz, and Glavtyumenneftegazstroy; governmental awards have been presented to the Megionskaya Petroleum Prospecting Expedition, the Yuganskneft' Petroleum and Gas Extraction Administration, the Nefteyuganskgazstroy Trust, the Kondinskiy Timber Industry Combine, the Borovskaya Poultry Farm, the kol-khozes imeni A. Matrosov and Pamyat' Kirova, Yertlinskiy Sovkhoz, and others.

Party and Komsomol members are the nucleus of the labor collectives. Twenty percent of the oblast's adult population are party or Komsomol members.

Over 77 percent of the membership of the oblast party organization is engaged in material production. After the 25th CPSU Congress the number of party members rose to 27 percent in the gas, 24 percent in the petroleum, and 22 percent in the construction industry. In an effort to extend the party's influence in all aspects of life, the party gorkoms and raykoms created hundreds of new primary and shop organizations and over 800 party groups. The strengthening of the party nucleus of labor collectives is continuing.

The extensive construction underway in Tyumen' is attracting young people. As early as 1965 the Komsomol Central Committee proclaimed the development of the Tyumen' subsoil an all-union shock Komsomol construction project. Today over 50 percent of the workers of Glavtyumenneftegaz are young people. All in all the oblast has 13 all-union shock construction projects and almost 1,500 Komsomol-Youth labor collectives. The oblast Komsomol organization was awarded the Labor Red Banner Order.

Thirteen years ago the first student detachment--boys and girls from Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Khar'kov, Odessa, Kazan', Volgograd, and Novosibirsk--came to our oblast. Last year the results of the activities of this combined construction detachment equalled 74 million rubles of capital investments used, tens of completed projects, and thousands of cultural-educational measures.

Many demobilized soliders and seamen come to the Tyumen' construction projects with Komsomol assignments. As a rule, they already have a skill and practical experience, and are disciplined, having been trained by the Soviet Army and border troops.

A comprehensive automation program is being implemented at the petroleum and gas fields, on a broad scale, and labor mechanization is growing. However, as before, strong and energetic people are needed. However, we need not simply manpower, we need skilled construction and installation workers, drivers, drillers, and other specialists. It would be good for the Komsomol organizations to train young people for work in Tyumenskaya Oblast. One must come here not "for the sake of the fogs and the smell of the Tayga," but in order to look for, extract, and process petroleum and gas, and build.

Let us emphasize that many people come to the underpopulated areas of the Tyumen' north with the intention of settling here for a long time, forever. The state is spending approximately 20,000 rubles per person to provide proper facilities for settling along the middle reaches of the Ob'; double that amount is spent for settling in Yamal. In the past 12 years over 11 million square meters of housing, and many new schools, kindergartens, nurseries, culture, trade, and consumer service establishments and communal facilities have been built. The city of Nizhnevartovsk has replaced the small settlement. Today it has a population of 87,000. Cities such as Nefteyugansk, Nadym, Uray, and others have replaced the small squatter's holdings.

Nevertheless, the problem of comfortable apartments and dormitories remains acute. Last February, measures for the further improvement of socio-living conditions of workers in petroleum and gas extraction areas were extensively considered. In the remaining three years of the five-year plan about 3.2 million square meters of housing, new schools and preschool institutions, technology and culture houses, sports complexes with swimming pools, hospitals, polyclinics, pharmacies, laundries, service enterprises, and many others will be built.

The people of Tyumen' have the right to hope for the more effective and faster help of ministries and departments in developing and expanding house-building capacities already established in our oblast. For many years the USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction has been tolerating the fact that the big plants for reinforced concrete goods under its jurisdiction are still working at 50 percent of capacity and that the house building combine in Nizhnevartovsk. The Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises already knows that the Surgut House Building Combine is working at 50 percent of capacity while the Lokosovskiy Plant (Middle Ob') is producing only 3.5 million instead of 40 million bricks per year . . .

The team method has become widespread in the Tyumen' north among geologists, timbermen, petroleum and gas workers, construction workers, and fishermen. The worker lives with his family in the base city or settlement, periodically commuting to work. So far, however, this method has not been developed to the necessary extent. There still are no standard plans for team settlements of different sizes and purposes. Some people confuse "team" with "time serving." The obstacles here are the shortage of housing and of service amenities in base settlements.

There still are managers who believe that material incentives could compensate for temporary living hardships. Yes, the state pays both "north" and considerable production wage supplements and bonuses. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the average wage in the oblast's petroleum industry rose 60 percent while labor productivity doubled. However, even with such wages, deprived of minimum living comforts, skilled workers are forced to leave. Naturally, others replace them. However, time is wasted while the novices learn to work as productively.

Let us take as an example pipeline builders. In Tyumenskaya Oblast they have work for not 5 but 10 or more years. Currently they are laying the first segment of the Urengoy-Chelyabinsk Main Pipeline. It will be followed by a second and a third . . . Should we, as in the past, rely essentially on imported manpower and build temporary settlements along the track? Would it not be better for the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises to invest in the building of comfortable housing in the nearby cities and settlements, and to develop new labor collectives permanently employed in Tyumenskaya Oblast? The same could be said of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation and USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction.

Accepting people from other krais and oblasts, the Tyumen' party organization and economic organs are concerned with training cadres on the spot. An agricultural, medical, industrial, and engineering-construction institute, two teachers' institutes, and state university have been opened. In 1977 the seven high and 28 secondary specialized schools in Tyumenskaya Oblast trained over 10,000 specialists. In 1977 18,356 workers graduated from local vocational-technical schools. However, this is insufficient. Ministries and departments are not showing any interest in expanding the training of skilled workers directly in Tyumenskaya Oblast. Little is being done to develop higher and secondary specialized training by correspondence or at night school in the petroleum and gas extracting areas. For many years the local party committees have been submitting specific proposals. So far, however, no answer has been received.

Members of 72 nationalities are participating in the establishment and development of the Tyumen' national economic complex. Each labor collective, starting with the brigade and team, reflects as in a mirror for fraternal friendship and comradeship inherent in the new historical community--the Soviet people. Over 80 percent of the oblast's population consists of Russians; there are over 7 percent Tatars and the largest groups of the nationalities of the north, Siberia, and the Far East, such as Khanty, Nentsy, Mansi, and Sel'kupy. There are considerable numbers of Ukrainians, Chuvashs, and others.

The main bridgehead of the petroleum industry is located on the territory of Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug and of the gas industry in the Yamalo-Nenetskiy Autonomous Okrug. The Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug was awarded the Orders of Lenin and of Friendship Among the Peoples for great successes achieved in the development of petroleum extraction and of the entire national economy and culture. The successful work of the working people of the Yamalo-Nenetskiy Autonomous Okrug was rewarded with the orders of Friendship Among the Peoples and Labor Red Banner.

The members of the socialist comity are making a substantial contribution to the development of the Tyumen' complex. The construction workers include several thousand citizens of the Bulgarian People's Republic. Hundreds of Czechoslovak Tatra dump-trucks and Hungarian Ikarus motor vehicles may be seen on the northern roads. Petroleum equipment is supplied by Romania.

Cranes, machine tools, and railroad cars come from the GDR. Polish and Yugoslav items are being used at petroleum and gas fields, by geologists and construction workers. Materials from a number of capitalist countries who are trading with the Soviet Union on a mutually profitable good neighborly basis are being used here as well.

The course charted at the 23rd, 24th, and 25th party congresses is being implemented. The Tyumen' national economic complex is in operation. In no more than 10 years this Tayga area became the main petroleum base of the USSR. Petroleum and gas are being steadily delivered to the Urals, the center, and the southern and eastern parts of the country. Powerful gas and chemical industries are developing.

Over the past 10 years other sectors have been rapidly gathering strength. Since 1965 machine building and metal processing output has quadrupled; electric power production has increased 11 times, while the timber and timber processing industries have more than doubled. Within that period the production of group "B" goods more than doubled while the average annual gross output of public agriculture rose 61 percent in the first two years of 10th Five-Year Plan compared with the Seventh.

Tyumenskaya Oblast was awarded the Order of Lenin for successes achieved by the working people in economic and cultural construction and developing petroleum and gas deposits. Last April Comrade L. I. Brezhnev warmly congratulated the people of Tyumen' with their great labor victory--the extraction of the billionth ton of oil since the beginning of the development of West Siberian deposits. "On the basis of the solution of major scientific and technical and organizational problems," the congratulation stated, "in the complex natural-weather conditions of this area, you developed the main base of the country for petroleum extraction and reached a pace of development of petroleum deposits unparalleled in world practice."

At a New Stage

It was stressed at the December 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum that the question of the need to implement the next step in the program for the comprehensive development of the subsoil and of the production forces of Western Siberia arises most urgently. On the basis of the increased help of the state and the entire country, and the constant attention and support of the CPSU Central Committee, Central Committee politbureau and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the Tyumen' party organization is directing the efforts of the oblast's working people above all to the development of the fuel-energy sectors.

In the first two years of the current five-year plan approximately as much petroleum and gas have been extracted as in the first 10 years of the development of the deposits. The gas processing industry, utilizing petroleum gas, is rapidly gathering strength. This five-year plan its capacity will

be nearly tripled. Two plants with an overall capacity of 4 billion cubic meters were completed in Nizhnevartovsk. Petroleum gas which was previously mostly burned is now being supplied to the industrial cities of Western Siberia along the Nizhnevartovsk-Kuzbass pipeline. The Surgut 1.5 million kilowatt capacity GRES is using gas fuel.

In the first two years of the five-year plan geologists discovered 15 new petroleum and gas deposits. Within that period yet another 10 petroleum deposits were developed along with facilities for the treatment of 68 million tons of petroleum and 28 million cubic meters of gas per year. Over 300 kilometers of railroad tracks have been laid from Surgut to Nizhnevartovsk and to Urengoy. Hard surfaced vehicle tracks 560 kilometers long were built. The volume of products flowing through pipelines rose 60 percent. Today the Tyumen' Civil Aviation Administration is accounting for one-sixth of the Aeroflot air freight haulage. A number of big livestock and poultry complexes have been organized.

Discussing the tasks stemming from the decisions of the December 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev's speeches in the course of his trip to Siberia and the Far East and his speech at the 18th Komsomol Congress, the oblast, okrug, city, and rayon party committees, the primary party organizations, and the collectives of working people are thoroughly studying their achievements, focusing their attention above all on shortcomings and bottlenecks, and seeking internal reserves. A number of sectors and a certain number of enterprise and organization collectives are still lagging in terms of volumes of output and quality indicators compared with the five-year plan control figures. There are cases of negligence, departmentalism, inertia, and indifference.

Never before has the Tyumen' party organization and all oblast working people had to resolve such vast and complex problems as those of 1978. It was emphasized at the oblast party committee plenum that the highest possible level of organization must be reached at all levels of management and administration and by the labor collectives. A radical turn must be taken toward intensive production methods, extensive and comprehensive creative search for reserves, and the adoption of immediate specific actions. It is precisely such an approach that is the core of the socialist obligations of the oblast's working people in 1978, the shock year of the five-year plan.

Here are some of the levels to be reached. The petroleum and gas industries will account for the entire all-union increase in petroleum and gas extraction. The country will receive from the Tyumen' ground nearly 250 million tons of petroleum and slightly less than 100 billion cubic meters of gas. Whereas since the beginning of the exploitation of the deposits almost 13 years had to pass before the first billion tons of petroleum was extracted, the second billion will be reached in approximately 3 years.

The drilling of exploratory years will be increased by over 50 percent; geologists will survey more deposits than in the previous two years. Capital

construction must insure this success. It is important not only to use the billions of rubles but mandatorily to complete priority projects: New pipelines, two power units at the Surgut GRES, and hundreds of kilometers of motor vehicle and railroads. The building of the main Urengoy-Tyumen'-Kurgan-Chelyabinsk Gas Pipeline is of particular importance. Before August about 1,500 kilometers of pipeline, 1,420 millimeters in diameter, must be laid.

During the year the builders of the Tobol'sk Petrochemical Combine will carry out a volume of construction and installation work unequal either domestically or abroad in terms of technical and economic indicators. Synthetic rubber, plastics, chemical fertilizers, and the products of petroleum refining constitute a very partial list of what this combine will supply the country. Twenty thousand construction workers will be required to insure the completion of the project. In the near future the population of Tobol'sk is expected to quadruple.

The agricultural workers will note the third year of the five-year plan with their shock work. The development of other sectors will be continued at a high pace. The emphasis is on quality, economy, and thrift. In one year the volume of output bearing the Emblem of Quality must rise 33 percent. The production of 300 new types of goods will be mastered.

The guarantee that the third year of the five-year plan will be the year of shock labor is the extensive scope of the socialist competition under the slogan of "Let Us Work Today Better than Yesterday and Tomorrow Better than Today!" as well as the close unity of the working people rallied around the Leninist party and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, and the firm resolve of the people of Tyumen' to make a worthy contribution to the implementation of the historical decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress.

5003
CSO: 1802

ORIENTATION TOWARD END NATIONAL ECONOMIC RESULTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russia No 8, May 78 pp 43-54

[Article by O. Korolev, general director of the Krasnyy Proletariy Machine Tool Building Production Association in Moscow]

[Text] The party's stipulation for effectiveness means, as was emphasized in the materials of the 25th CPSU Congress, that profound quality changes must be reached in the structure and technical standard of the national economy and that its very appearance must be changed substantially. The solution of this tremendous problem demanded of each production collective to redefine its "position in the working ranks," and to assess the results of its activities from the viewpoint of the future development of the entire national economy and the fullest possible satisfaction of its needs.

On the Fate of the Universal Lathe

Machine building and, within, the machine tool industry, has been assigned a considerable role in the implementation of the tremendous socioeconomic program earmarked by the Communist Party. The systematic development of comprehensive mechanization and automation in all processing industry sectors largely depends on the quality of its machine tools--on their productivity, reliability, machining precision, and a number of other technical and economic characteristics insuring high economic effectiveness of output.

Along with technical and economic problems, the machine tool industry must resolve social problems, the most important among which is the reduction of manual labor and the development of the type of new production facilities which would comprehensively contribute to the elimination of the major disparity between mental and physical labor.

Formulating the way for the development of machine tool building in the new five-year plan, the 25th Congress took fully into consideration its growing role in the technical retooling of the production process under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. Our sector is faced with the task of increasing its volume of output by 50-60 percent, improve the

structure of produced metal processing equipment in order to meet to the fullest extent the needs of industry, insuring priority development to the production of machine tools with digital programming, and considerably increasing the production of special machine tools and automated lines for large series and mass production sectors. Undertaking the practical implementation of the congress assignments our plant's collective set as its objective to reach the highest possible end national economic results, using to this purpose all available resources. This approach demanded of the collective, above all, to review the existing structure of the manufactured equipment.

Krasnyy Proletariy manufactures lathes used by practically all industrial enterprises. Most of them are universal screw-cutting lathes.

Let us point out that the initial draft plan formulated by the plant for the 10th Five-Year Plan called for a considerable increase in the production of progressive types of machine tools. At the same time, however, it called for increasing the production of under-equipped universal screw-cutting lathes. They were to become the main type of output of the plant for the entire five-year plan. This view limited the plant's possibilities for technical and economic development and prevented the most efficient utilization of its production potential. It was in this connection that the question of the fate of the universal lathe arose.

It can be easily seen that the significance of the problem far exceeded the framework of the interests of the plant's collective as shown by a comparison of the following facts:

1. Krasnyy Proletariy has an annual output accounting for one-third of all lathes manufactured in the country.
2. Lathes account for the biggest percentage of metal cutting equipment, approximately one-third.
3. About 50 percent of the universal screw-cutting lathes in operation today at the machine building enterprises and to be replaced in the next 10 years have been made by Krasnyy Proletariy.

The technical and economic characteristics of the machine tools which the plant either currently produces or is preparing for production will largely determine the level of economic effectiveness of many enterprises not only in the current period but in the distant future. That is why the question of the basic output of the plant is an important national economic problem which must be resolved in accordance with the main trends of scientific and technical progress.

Under the influence of scientific and technical progress and with the increased scale of social production, changes are occurring in the very organization of the process. A conversion to large series, assembly line, and

mass manufacturing of various commodities is taking place every more extensively. Conversely, the share of individual and small series production, still significant today, is steadily diminishing. However, the various types of output require different machine tools, as the structure of the machine tool fleet largely reflects the structure of the production process. Special and specialized machine tools, semi-automatic and automatic machines, and machine tools with digital programming are used in large series, mass, and assembly line production. Since their purpose is to machine large series of parts, high machining precision and the highest labor productivity may be reached with them. Universal machine tools are used in individual and small series production. With few exceptions (one-of-a-kind machine tools for big multiple-ton items), they are used for machining a number of parts for a great variety of purposes. This restricts possibilities for upgrading labor productivity.

Taking into consideration the progressive changes occurring in the organization of the public production process, conclusions may be drawn concerning the forthcoming changes in the machine tool fleet and the output of the machine tool manufacturing industry. Naturally, individual and small series production will never disappear entirely. Nevertheless, its share will be lowered and, with it, the share of universal machine tools. The development of this trend will yield the national economy tremendous advantages, for improving the structure of produced metal processing equipment aimed at the fullest possible satisfaction of industrial requirements is becoming now one of the important factors in the growth of the socioeconomic effectiveness of public production.

The emphasis on effectiveness and quality demands of all production workers a psychological retuning, and the orientation of the work of each collective toward end national economic results. Today it is no longer sufficient for a production collective to upgrade effectiveness at its enterprise. The highest economic results will be achieved only when, along with the solution of this problem, it will help to increase the effectiveness of enterprises consuming its output. This must be achieved, above all, by comprehensively upgrading the quality of output.

The most necessary condition for an orientation toward end national economic results presumes an orientation toward the needs of the consumer, the consideration of his interests. If a commodity fails to satisfy the demands of the consumer, naturally, it would not be considered good however well it might have been made. In many cases, however, acknowledgment of the consumer and increased demand are still no proof that a given commodity satisfies best social requirements. If the consumer is oriented toward obsolete rather than promising technological processes and corresponding forms of labor and production organization, his requirements will hold back rather than stimulate technical progress. Unfortunately, machine builders come frequently across such cases.

Formulating our plans for the production of the 16K20 universal screw-cutting lathe, every occasion we had to deal with the problem of its scarcity. The lathe had been awarded the state Emblem of Quality and earned a reputation abroad. Demand for this lathe could not be fully met even by doubling or tripling output. It became necessary to determine whether or not such scarcity truly existed. The overall study of the trend of scientific and technical progress in machine tool building, in any case, did not support this.

Statistical data were collected and summed up on the technological and dimensional parameters of parts manufactured with universal average dimension lathes (3,000 types of pieces with an overall annual production program of 1 million pieces) were gathered by the Experimental Scientific Research Institute of Metal Cutting Machine Tools from 80 machine building and metal processing enterprises. The following characteristics were recorded in the course of the data gathering process: Labor intensiveness, dimension ratios, securing method, level of machining complexity, precision, nature of the machined shape and, finally, and very importantly, type of series. The huge amount of data were processed with a computer and reduced to 209 basic groups. The share of each group was determined by labor intensiveness.

The classification of the machined parts based on the most important technological characteristics made it possible to provide an overall assessment of the effectiveness with which universal lathes were used and, on the basis of progressive technology, establish the factual machine building and metal processing needs for various types of lathes and to determine the progressive structure of their manufacturing. The study revealed that nearly one-third of the parts--30 percent of overall labor intensiveness--could be classified in the series or large series production. It became entirely clear that the use of universal lathes here was inexpedient. They were not being used for their specific purpose and had to be replaced by other machine tools which would make it possible to use the advantages offered by large-scale output. In individual and small series production, as a result of the uneven load and the disparity among machined parts in terms of required precision, dimensions, machining systems, and high technical characteristics of the 16K20 type lathe, it is not being used to its full potential. The study indicated that in many enterprises universal screw-cutting lathes are not operating at maximal capacity and highest speed. A shortcoming was revealed which, unfortunately, may be found not only in the manufacturing of machine tools: A disparity or incomplete consistency between the structure of the equipment and the nature of the work performed.

One of the main reasons for such phenomena is the existence of shortcomings in the organization of the production process at many enterprises and individual industrial sectors. Possibilities for the establishment of specialized sectors and shops are not used everywhere; the share of auxiliary production remains high; repair services are widely scattered; spare parts for many types of equipment are produced in insufficient quantities. All this hinders the reduction of the share of underproductive individual output, thus adversely affecting the structure of the produced equipment.

The computations made for the various types of machining operations carried out with universal lathes, broken down by labor intensiveness, enable us to determine the progressive structure of the fleet of medium sized lathes.

Machine Tool Family	Existing Structure of Machine Tools of the Lathe Group, percent	Progressive Struc- ture of the Fleet, percent
Universal (base)	76.0	30.4
Modifications	6.0	21.0
Programmed machine tools	1.5	13.5
Specialized and equipped	12.5	23.5
Special	4	11.6
Total	100.0	100.0

The following data show benefits to the national economy of considerably reducing the production of universal screw-cutting lathes and drastically increasing the production of machine tools with dimensional, precision, and purpose modifications, including machine tools with digital programming, and specialized and special machine tools. The same amount of work would require 31.7 percent less machine tools and labor productivity would be 40 percent higher. In machine building and metal processing 180,000 lathes will be needed instead of 250,000. Furthermore, considering the fact that the use of new modifications would expand possibilities for multiple machine tool servicing, we would see that 84,000 less machine tool operators would be needed.

The meaning of such figures should be considered to understand the current importance of the fate of the universal lathe. This is a problem of developing the progressive structure of the machine tool fleet related to a number of aspects of upgrading the socioeconomic effectiveness of public production.

However, it would be erroneous to think that its solution would be entirely determined by expanding the production of new progressive machine tool models. The problem also lies in the way such machine tools would be used. In order for the national economy to benefit most from them substantial changes should be made in the production organization itself at enterprises and, above all, in the systematic development of specialization.

A Family of Machine Tools

Krasnyy Proletariy has organized the large series conveyor belt production of machine tools with a high level of cooperated supplies, thus insuring its high effectiveness. Directing the collective toward achieving the highest possible end national economic results in the 10th Five-Year Plan, the party organization call for retaining the essential economic and organizational-technical advantages of large series production and insuring the large-scale production of a broad range of machine tools meeting the requests of a great variety of users.

Guided by the party's instructions on making the 10th Five-Year Plan one of effectiveness and quality, the plant's collective formulated its own variant of the plant's five-year plan, substantially different from the initial draft plan, and gained its approval. Instead of expanding further the production of universal lathes without attachments, i.e., instead of extensive development, the intensive method was chosen: The creation of a family of machine tools for all types of work starting with a base model. Each modification of a machine tool within this family should, furthermore, be consistent with the specific technological conditions of a given sector. The collected and summed up statistical data made it possible to take into consideration more differentiatedly the specific conditions of work with lathes and, on this basis, introduce respective changes in their design.

Practical experience proved that the most effective method which makes it possible to upgrade the productivity of machine tools produced by the plant within a relatively short time is equipping them with additional systems and attachments which the user could use both separately or as a set. Such technological fittings yield considerable benefits. Lathe attachments developed in recent years could be very usefully applied in all types of output, including the production of individual items. Their use enables us to upgrade machining accuracy, shortly reduce defects, lower the time spent in manual operations, and increase the share of machine time. This increases the possibilities for multiple machine tool operating. However, despite the obvious advantages, the scale of output of thusly equipped machine tools were insufficient until recently. As a result, many enterprises were forced to manufacture attachments by themselves, frequently with inadequate facilities, which, naturally, effected their quality. The production of technological fittings, if organized on a mass scale, would yield tremendous economic results not only by increasing the productivity of the new machine tools but also because it would make it possible to improve the operational qualities of installed machine tool equipment.

Nearly 25 percent of all parts machined on lathes (24 percent in terms of labor intensiveness) require higher precision. In this case the use of machine tools with increased and particularly high precision work accounts for a considerable growth of labor productivity and production quality, for this reduces or eliminates subsequent finishing operations, yielding additional economic benefits.

The modified family based on the 16K20 screw-cutting lathe includes over 40 models combined in several groups (basic) dimension and precision modifications; fitting (target) modifications; specialized modifications; machine tools with digital programming; and special machine tools.

The first group models are for single or small series production. They include higher and high precision lathes, the 16K25 universal light weight screw-cutting lathe, and the 16K20G and 16K25G models with gaps. The latter could be effectively used by Sel'khoztekhnika sections. The group of fitted (target) modifications includes eight models with combinations of the following additional attachments: coordinate reading electronic system, hydraulic duplication multypass system, short thread turning system, and automated feeding control system. Their use makes it possible to specialize the lathe for certain operations and thus considerably to upgrade its productivity.

Let us cite examples. In terms of labor intensiveness about 20 percent of all machining work is spent in turning short threads. The use of a fast thread cutting system makes it possible to upgrade the lathe's productivity 63 percent and to save 13,000 rubles per year. Thanks to the use of a hydraulic duplications stand in series production, labor productivity rises by 20 percent; with an automated work system a single operator can handle several lathes. Equipping some models with digital systems has increased productivity by up to 40 percent, for it no longer becomes necessary to stop the lathe for repeated control measurements of the machined part. The working conditions of the lathe turner become considerably better and machining precision rises substantially. The use of such lathes saves from 1,900 to 8,700 rubles per year.

The plant developed a big group of specialized and special modifications and machine tools with digital programming. This group includes machine tools which raise labor productivity 6-8 times and yield annual savings of up to 260,000 rubles.

Converting to the making of numerous modifications, the plant, the first in the history of world machine tool building to use a conveyor belt, might have had to abandon the advantages of assembly line production and to breakdown and divide the assembly lines. Instead of the three models produced in 1973 over 40 modifications and various designs had to be mastered. In addition to the 460 original parts of the base 16K20 model, the production of yet another 1,038 parts included in the modification had to be made possible, as a result of which the series type manufacturing had to be lowered considerably. The increased share of small series or single machine tool output could have brought about a decline in the technical standard of output and the loss of a great percentage of the resulting savings. This method was unacceptable and other solutions had to be found. Converting to the production of new types of high quality items, we had to see to it that the economic effectiveness of the output at the enterprise would be increased rather than reduced. This is, perhaps, the main difficulty for, as a rule, upgrading quality is related to higher production outlays. On the basis

of its own experience and of the leading enterprises in the sector and scientific and technical developments, the plant's collective was able to find effective technical and organizational solutions.

Above all, parts had to be standardized in the technological preparations for the production of new lathes. The 460 parts of the base model of the universal 16K20 lathe were taken as a basis. In each of its modifications 425 to 460 such parts were used, thanks to which the overall level of standardization exceeded 90 percent for a number of models. This offered great possibilities for improving the organization of the production process.

The plant converted from item specialization (in which each production facility manufactured one machine tool model) to parts and technological specialization. To this purpose a cog wheel shop with an overall annual output of 750,000 pieces, and several new technological sectors were set up. The use of highly productive equipment and the extensive use of machine tools with digital programming and of tools made of super hard materials considerably upgraded the economic effectiveness of output. This made it possible to free 1,500 square meters of work area which, in turn, made it possible to develop the specialized production of over 500 different parts and increase the production of settings for vertical multit spindle semi-automatic machines 50 percent.

Quick-resetable lines for the machining of multiple parts appeared in the plant's shops. Conversion from one type of parts to another is considerably accelerated thanks to the use of various lathe attachments: quick-resetable special, adjusting, and clamping attachments. The maneuverability and flexibility of the technological lines were considerably upgraded for lathes with digital programming are used for turning, drilling, milling, and thread cutting operations. Currently along a single production line batches of parts of very different series could be processed. This provided a practical solution to one of the most difficult specialization problems.

Launching the initiative of developing families of lathes, the plant's collective made, above all, a practical test of the worth of its suggestion. Many universal lathes produced at the plant's shops and sectors were replaced by lathes with attachments, specialized and special lathes, and lathes with digital programming. Labor productivity rose sharply, work area was released, the volume of output rose substantially and its economic effectiveness increased.

Production Quality

One of the important means for the implementation of the instructions of the 25th Congress on the reorganization of the economic mechanism and on directing all its units toward end national economic results is the application and improvement of comprehensive quality control systems.

The merit of the labor collectives of leading enterprises in L'vov, Yaroslavl', Moscow, and Leningrad is that they initiated the development of the type of production control systems which insure steady quality improvements thanks to the comprehensive utilization of economic, social, technical, and organizational factors. The creation of a comprehensive quality control system marked the appearance of a new progressive form of production organization most consistent with the conditions and requirements of the scientific and technical revolution. The main objective toward which this organization directs the entire labor collective is reached through the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, strengthened ties between science and production, improved work quality, and ever fuller consideration of consumer and national economic requirements and needs.

The plant undertook the development of such a system in 1973, with the decision to manufacture the new 16K20 lathe on the basis of uniform technical conditions. The system elaborated by the plant together with the sectorial institute was based on standards determining the work procedure of all plant services and subdivisions and their rights and obligations. By this token efforts to improve quality stopped being sporadic. The lack of coordination caused by a number of frequently conflicting instructions and technical stipulations was eliminated. The entire life cycle of the items, beginning with the designing of a lathe and ending with its utilization, was henceforth subordinated to strict regulations which called for the implementation of a set of measures. The application of high level standards (for example, intraplant precision norms are 40 percent stricter than state standard norms) and of systematic control over their observance drastically upgraded technological discipline and the technical standards of designs and quality of output.

All models of machine tools produced by the plant are developed by the department of the chief designer, one of the biggest in the sector. As a rule, the new machine tools have original designs equivalent to inventions. Greater attention was paid in the design stage to a broad range of technical and economic indicators of the new models. The chart of the technical standard and quality of output calls for a rating of the following machine tool indicators: Purpose, level of technical advance, technological possibilities, reliability and durability, economic and ergonomic characteristics, level of standardization and unification, patent purity, and level of industrial esthetics. The quality of the new design, covering the extensive number of indicators and patent purity is achieved with comparisons with best analogues of the machine tool available worldwide. A mandatory condition for the development of new machine tool models is their technological control conducted by the department of the chief technologist, and the metrological expert evaluation.

Currently the plant produces all machine tools on the basis of uniform technological conditions. From 1973 to 1977 the volume of output for export quadrupled. The plant became the biggest lathe exporter in the world.

Its output is shipped to 70 countries, including the FRG, France, England, Italy, and Sweden. Within the same period 44 inventions were applied in lathe designs and technological processes; the equipment produced by the plant is protected by 29 patents and 44 authorship certificates.

"The practical application of new scientific ideas," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th Congress, "is today no less important than their development." It is no secret that many high quality goods are unable to reach the consumer for a long time even though their design development has been completed. Quite frequently this is explained by a lag in the technical level of output. In order to avoid this gap we must promptly apply progressive technology insuring the fast renovation of output. In this connection the comprehensive quality control system we have developed pays particular attention to the stage of technological preparations at which we must determine the ways and means for the manufacturing of a new commodity. Let us point out that occasionally it is more difficult to resolve this problem than to create a new design. We know that the quality of a machine tool--its reliability and durability, and the precision with which it can machine goods--largely depends on the precision with which its own parts were made. In designing technological processes, the plant stipulated a guaranteed level of accuracy for each operation. This called for changing the structure of the metal cutting equipment by increasing, among others, the percentage of high and increased precision lathes used in finishing operations. The number of such lathes was increased 2.7 times.

Additional possibilities for precision in processing the most important parts of all lathe modifications--beds, spindles, and cog wheels--were obtained thanks to the use of progressive technological solutions. Thus, the finishing grinding of guide beds, based on tolerances computed in the plant's laboratories, totally eliminated the influence of the precision assembling of the lathe caused by bed deformations. For the first time in our country spindles were ground in hydrostatic back stays and cog wheels of an adhesive design were applied. The role of heat processing of the bearing part surfaces rose considerably. Thus, the application of an industrial method for ion nitrogen hardening in glow discharge of the most important and complexly shaped parts made possible to achieve the high quality of such parts and, at the same time, lower their labor intensive-ness.

The development of a new lathe design and of a progressive technology are very important stages in the life cycle of the item. However, this is merely half the work. We must also achieve the stable and steadily rising quality of output at the production stage. This requires high quality work on the part of every member of the collective. A great deal depends on his skill, initiative, conscious discipline, mastery of the equipment, and creative attitude toward the work. That is why the comprehensive system pays such great attention to the organization of faultless work. The task was made practically possible thanks to the creation and application of a number of indicators assessing both the work of the individual production

worker and of entire subunits, as well as the implementation of a number of measures including moral and material incentives, daily work rating, control over the strict observance of technological discipline, and plant certification of parts and assembly units. Every worker and member of the engineering and technical personnel at the plant is taught the quality control system. This enables all members of the collective to participate knowledgeably in the practical solution of many technical, economic, and organizational problems.

However advanced planned control methods may be, the full check of the manufactured item is made at the enterprises using it directly in production conditions. That is why, while concerned with improving the quality of output, we must be in constant touch with the consumer who is aware of the merits and shortcomings of the item, and consider his opinion on the operational data of the lathe. Such a "feedback" becomes an important element in the comprehensive quality control system. It makes the production process more flexible and enables us to take promptly into consideration changes in national economic requirements. It increases our responsibility for improving further the operational qualities of the lathes.

With a view to broadening and strengthening relations with consumers conferences are sponsored at which plant representatives submit specific suggestions and wishes on improving the technical and economic characteristics of the lathes we produce. The special reliability service set up at the department of the chief designer systematically studies the work of the lathes and takes into consideration remarks submitted by workers, mechanics, and technologists. The materials of such studies, supplemented by reports of the Ministry of Foreign Trade Inspection, and reports by plant fitters who accompany the lathes to provide technical assistance, are processed with a computer and analyzed by the reliability bureau. It is on this basis that specific suggestions are made on further improvements on reliability and durability. This enables the plant steadily to improve the design of its lathes and their production technology. Thus, in the past four years about 100 major structural changes have been made in the modifications of machine tools, thanks to which their service life before capital repairs has been extended by 40 percent, reaching 8-11 years. Taking into consideration the fact that the cost of capital repairs is today considerably higher than that of the lathe itself, one could easily imagine the importance to the user of improvements in its reliability and durability indicators.

The application of a comprehensive quality control system at Krasnyy Proletariy enables the plant to be the first in lathe manufacturing to convert the production of all lathes according to single technical specifications. The share of goods awarded the state Emblem of Quality of the overall volume of output rose from 18.9 percent in 1973 to 64.3 percent in 1977 while the number of superior category lathes rose from 4.8 to 93.4 percent. Entering the socialist competition for upgrading effectiveness and quality on the basis of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the plant's

collective achieved considerable results. For the first time in the practice of lathe manufacturing under large series production conditions, the production of universal lathes in a great variety of sizes, precision and target modifications, and fittings was organized. Between 1973 and 1977 the share of such equipment nearly quadrupled, reaching 40 percent of the overall number of lathes produced; the production of lathes with digital programming rose 2.4 times and accounts today, respectively, for 23.4 percent of the total.

Savings to the national economy from the use of the equipment produced by the plant within that period exceeded 68 million rubles.

It is very important to note that the line of technical development formulated by the collective, aimed at steadily upgrading the role of progressive types of equipment, insured the high rates of economic growth of the plant. From 1973 to 1977 the volume of marketable output rose 81.1 percent and conventional net output rose 116.6 percent. This increase was achieved almost totally as a result of higher labor productivity. Production costs of the base model dropped 14 percent and capital returns rose considerably --38.3 percent. The annual economic savings rose from 11.5 million rubles in 1974 to 19.4 million rubles in 1977.

As these data show, the conversion of the plant to the production of new types of output yielded double economic results: Results for the consumers using this output and results in the plant's own output. Naturally, such results can not be reached automatically. The plant's collective worked hard to develop new models of highly productive equipment and prepare all shops and sectors for its production. Understanding the importance and responsibility of the task of steadily upgrading social production effectiveness, the Krasnyy Proletariy workers and engineering and technical personnel launched their initiative supported by a number of machine building enterprises.

In his congratulatory letter to the plant's collective Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "Your patriotic initiative, expressed through the clear and effective slogan of 'first-grade equipment in the five-year plan of effectiveness and quality' reflects the very essence of the main task facing lathe manufacturing and all machine building in the new stage of the building of communism . . . It is particularly important that your plans are already now being implemented. It is precisely thus, without delays, that complex, sometimes difficult, yet projects needed by the country must be undertaken."

This high assessment created great commitment. Presently, under the guidance of the party organization and with the active participation of the entire collective, the main directions of the plant's and association's technical and economic development in the 11th and 12th Five-Year Plans are being elaborated. The study of the trends of scientific and technical progress indicates that in the 1980's profound changes will take place in machine building which will rise to a qualitatively new level. Therefore,

the promising directions are being developed on the basis of the consideration of all possibilities created for machine tool building as a result of the development of related industrial sectors and, above all, of the electrical engineering, electronic, metallurgical, and instruments manufacturing industries, as well as on the basis of the consideration of the requirements with which the development of social production will face the machine tool building industry.

One of the main directions is that of lathes with digital programming. The plant's designers have elaborated a range of machine tools with digital programming whose capacity has been tripled. The new models enable us considerably to upgrade the speed of cutting and the use of progressive instruments. The number of instrument blocks in them has been raised to 16 and could be raised further. Such machine tools are the base for the development of multiple instrument machining centers to which the future in machine building belongs. Another path followed in designing lathes with digital programming is the development of broadly universal lathes programmed in advance by the workers themselves with the help of a special control panel. They could successfully replace all universal lathes in machine building for individual and small series production and drastically upgrade labor productivity.

In the next few years the list of progressive types of lathe equipment produced by the plant will be expanded by very high precision lathes and models of special lathes based on the broadest possible design and technological standardization.

The pace of scientific progress depends not only on the scale of output of progressive types of equipment but on the way such equipment is used. This leads to the very important problem of relations between producers and users. We believe that this is the main problem in the efforts of a production collective to reach the best possible end national economic results. The only way to resolve it is through the joint efforts of the manufacturing enterprise and the users, aimed at achieving the greatest economic effectiveness. The overall economic effect of such enterprises acting separately is, in all cases, lesser than the one which could be achieved through coordinated efforts. However, in order to insure such efforts progressive production organization methods must be applied.

The manufacturing enterprise must steadily study the production conditions of its customers and take their specific characteristics into consideration in the development of new types of equipment. The consumer must be given not the type of "general purpose" anonymous lathe but the new technology embodied in the lathe, insuring high economic effectiveness. Understandably, the solution of this problem demands of the manufacturer to improve the organization of the production process and upgrade its flexibility and maneuverability. In turn, the consumer has the duty to accelerate to a maximal extent the utilization of the new equipment. This could be achieved only through organizational restructuring in the direction of intensified specialization.

Naturally, the enterprise's collective would be unable to resolve the entire set of problems related to improving the organization of output by relying exclusively on its own forces. Quite frequently this calls for the assistance of scientific research institutes and design and construction organizations. Nevertheless, as experience has indicated, its initiative in this matter could play the decisive role. Such an initiative is worthy of all support, for which reason conditions must be created under which it could be fully displayed.

In our view, enterprises and associations must be granted greater rights and have at their disposal adequate funds in order to be able operatively to reorganize the production process should this be required by the installation of new equipment. At the same time, we must raise the responsibility of the enterprise for improving the end national economic result and increase its economic interest in resolving this problem. To this effect the enterprise plans, in our view, should include assignments dealing with the size of both the immediate as well as the overall factual economic effect and insure a closer link between the size of the economic effect and economic incentive funds.

5003

CSO: 1802

FRUITFUL COOPERATION AMONG SCIENCES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 55-62

[Survey of letters to the editors]

[Text] The further strengthening of the alliance among social, natural, and technical sciences is an important prerequisite for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the solution of many social problems in our society, and the shaping of a scientific, dialectical-materialistic outlook. Their ever closer interaction is dictated, above all, by the inner logic of the development of scientific knowledge and the vital tasks of basic and applied research. "At the present stage of the country's development," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Congress, "the need for the further creative elaboration of theory becomes even greater rather than lesser. The new opportunities for fruitful research of a general theoretical, basic, and applied nature appear at the junction between different sciences and, particularly, of the natural and the social sciences. They should be used to the fullest extent."

The building of a communist society may be achieved only on the basis of the closest possible interaction among the social, natural, and technical sciences, and the alliance between science and practice. In turn, it is only under socialist conditions that the power of science and technology is used with maximum fullness and for the benefit of the entire people. "In accordance with social requirements," the USSR Constitution stipulates, "the state insures the planned development of science and the training of scientific cadres; it organizes the utilization of the results of scientific research in the national economy and the other realms of life."

Describing the objective trends of scientific development and indicating some key problems facing Soviet scientists and party organizations of scientific research, planning-design institutions, and higher educational establishments in the light of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, in its issue No 1 for 1977 KOMMUNIST published the article "Let Us Strengthen the Interconnection among Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences." A number of responses came as an answer to this article, confirming the topical nature of the tasks formulated by the Congress and the profound interest displayed by the scientists in their effective and systematic solution.

The letters to the editors sent by collectives of scientific institutions and individual scientists are imbued with a deep understanding of the party's policy at the present stage in the building of communism, clear awareness of the vital problems of scientific and technical and social progress, and concern for the further development of Soviet science. They extensively describe the theoretical and practical importance of the close interaction among social, natural, and technical sciences. They emphasize that at the present stage of the scientific and technical revolution the link between science and practice, the effectiveness of scientific development and the successful development of basic research largely depend on the extent of the integration among different sectors of scientific knowledge, and the level of mastery by the scientists of the entire wealth of Marxist-Leninist methodology. All this proves the outstanding vitality, under the conditions of a socialist society, of the Leninist idea of the alliance between philosophy and the natural sciences, and the considerable broadening of the base of this alliance in the course of the development of the scientific and technical revolution.

The integration of the sciences and the strengthening of their interconnection and creative cooperation are a complex dialectical process. In their letters the readers indicate the inadmissibility of a simplistic understanding of this process and of underestimating conceptual and methodological principles which are the basis for the development of the social, natural, and technical sciences and of their creative growth. An uncritical automatic extension of the concepts and methods of one science to another, and thoughtless extrapolations and formal summations could only confuse the scientist. The readers support the idea expressed in the editorial that any attempt at transferring concepts and methods should be "forestalled" by the dialectical-materialistic study of the possibility for such an extrapolation. Developing this thought, S. N. Mareyev (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy) emphasizes in his letter that the borrowing of ideas and methods of one science by another presumes their creative assimilation and reinterpretation in accordance with the specific subject and tasks of that specific science. Under such circumstances the study of dialectical "transitions" from one subject to another, and Lenin's idea of the transformation of opposites become particularly important. The underestimating of this dialectics inevitably leads to reductionism, to the substitution of the object of research, and to reducing superior forms of motion to inferior ones.

A number of letters draw attention to the serious difficulties existing in resolving methodological problems of scientific integration. This includes the question of the demarkation of research targets, and the correlation between "related" sciences such as, for example, geography and ecology, and physiology and psychology. The letters reemphasize the fact that the synthesis of social, natural, and technical sciences should not lead to identifying the subject of one science (psychology, for example) with that of another (physiology, for example). In his letter, V. V. Davydov, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences corresponding member (USSR Academy of

Pedagogical Sciences Scientific Research Institute of General and Pedagogical Psychology) notes that the identification of targets of research in the field of physiology of higher nervous activities and psychology blocks the way to understanding the socio-historical laws governing the formation and development of superior forms of mental activities and lead to the loss of the psychological aspect of a specific research target. The negative theoretical and practical consequences of this approach are particularly obvious in the field of pedagogical psychology. Yet, the readers equally emphasize the inadmissibility of underestimating natural scientific data in the study of the mind. In his letter E. A. Asryan, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Higher Nervous Activity and Neuro-Physiology) points out the need to strengthen practical cooperation and reciprocal understanding between physiologists and psychologists and for the more effective utilization of I. P. Pavlov's ideas in the field of physiology of higher nervous activity.

The study of dialectical transitions from abstract to concrete, general to specific, empirical to theoretical, and meaningful and formal in scientific knowledge, writes S. N. Mareyev, is a necessary prerequisite for the effective utilization of the ideas of mathematics, mathematical logic, and cybernetics in other sciences. The strict consideration of the dialectics of the abstract and the concrete, and of the general and the specific is of exceptional importance if it is a question of the use of abstract mathematical and cybernetic concepts in the study of social relations. Particularly important here is the proper "subordination" of concepts and ways and means. Formalism and the eclectic "crossing" of social, natural scientific, and technical knowledge are inadmissible.

All this means that under the conditions of the growing differentiation among sciences and the ever deeper integration of scientific knowledge, particularly responsible assignments face our philosophy which is the conceptual and methodological foundation for cooperation among sciences. The philosophical interpretation of the latest achievements in the social, natural, and technical sciences is one of the primary conditions for the further development of our outlook and methodology. However, the task of philosophy, writes E. V. Il'yenkov (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy) can not consist either of the passive recording of such achievements or in a type of their "summation" in which, following behind scientific progress, the philosopher simply ascribes philosophical categories to some general concepts and ideas. The philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism can not and must not be merely the "spreader" of ideas and results achieved in other fields of knowledge. Our philosophy is a system which is truly "open" to all new and fruitful ideas. However, this does not mean in the least that it is merely a container for the accumulation of general scientific information.

A study of dialectical transitions is needed also in order to organize proper relations between concrete-scientific and philosophical knowledge. It presumes the creative interpretation of new scientific data and their "dialectical processing" which would be inconceivable without a creative development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy itself, without the utilization and

multiplication of its wealth of ideas, and without the concretizing of its categories which are the result, conclusion, and summary of the entire history of knowledge and reorganization of the human world. We know that materialism inevitably changes its appearance with each epochal discovery in the natural sciences. It changes but does not lose it. It also changes its appearance with each epochal achievement and discovery in the social field. The harmonious development of natural scientific and social knowledge and the reciprocal enrichment of sciences presume the harmonious development of philosophy as an integral system of ideas. Any attempt to belittle humanitarian knowledge and depict this scientific area as the intuitive-novelistic description of facts which can be "scientifically" explained through the concepts and terms of physics, mathematics, cybernetics, or physiology, undermines the very idea of cooperation among sciences and leads to serious theoretical, practical, and ideological errors.

Interesting methodological problems of the interrelationship between basic and applied science, in connection with the editorial, are considered in the letter by I. S. Puchkov (Moscow State University, philosophy department, chair of theory and practice of communist education). The ever closer interconnection between basic and applied science, based on the solution of major comprehensive problems, is a characteristic of the interaction between them. The tasks formulated by the national economy are complex. Their implementation organically requires the integration of different scientific sectors. Therefore, the comprehensive study of any serious practical problem such as labor activity, demographic processes, rational utilization of resources, development of a fuel-energy base, and other most important problems formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress leads, as a rule, to the need for resolving the basic scientific problems and combining the efforts of a number of scientific collectives and directions of scientific research. Whereas in the period of the first industrial revolution the technical sciences were no more than the application of theoretical natural science to public production, after the conditions of the present scientific and technical revolution each one of them is a sum total of knowledge with its special theoretical elaboration.

According to the author the problems of integration among sciences have not as yet reached a proper reflection in philosophical and sociological publications: Little work has been done on the interrelationship between sciences on the historical level; the organizational forms of integration and the related problems of management of scientific research, cadre training, and others, have been insufficiently studied.

The conceptual and methodological problems of strengthening the cooperation between social and natural scientists, discussed by our readers, indicated that the forms of scientific integration could be quite different and that the debate on such matters, as well as on a number of other philosophical problems mentioned in the editorial, could be extended.

Characteristically, the letters sent by representatives of the natural and technical sciences express deep interest in the extensive utilization of the achievements of Marxist-Leninist social science, drawing the attention to the strengthened ties between methodology and ideology under present conditions. In turn, the social scientists express their deep respect for the work of the natural scientists, writing of the need for the ever more extensive utilization of the achievements of the natural sciences and of the ways and means they developed in the study of social processes.

A number of letters emphasized that the main problem whose solution represents the most profound synthesis of social, natural, and technical sciences today is the problem of man and his role in the transformation of nature and society. Important aspects of this complex problem, related to the development of the scientific and technical revolution, are described, for example, in the letter by Doctor of Psychological Sciences G. M. Zarakovskiy. In his view, considering the task of planning human activities in connection with the solution of the general problem of labor rationalization, philosophers, together with sociologists, psychologists, and engineers, must consider the fact that further production automation would not bring about any limitations to human creative activities. Non-automated and, particularly, semi-automated production paralyzes not only the freedom of activity of the worker but, in the author's opinion, also limits the possibility for converting from one type of activity to another. The planning of new types of activity with the further and ever broader production automation should follow the direction of the elimination of such shortcomings.

In addition to the formulation of philosophical problems, the letters contain considerations of more specific theoretical and even applied problems related to the study of man and his place in public production.

A profound synthesis among social, natural, and technical sciences has been definitely noted in the solution of problems related to the rationalization of human labor activities, production automation, optimal utilization of natural resources, environmental production, and effective placement of production forces. It is no accident, therefore, that a large number of letters received by the editors in connection with the publication of the article "Strengthening the Interconnection among Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences," deal with the role of science in upgrading public production effectiveness. The solution of the problems in this area largely determines the pace of social and cultural development in our country. This is the root of many other problems. Problems of further rationalization, and of upgrading work quality effect today both practical workers and social scientists and representatives of the natural and technical sciences.

As M. A. Kotik (Tartu State University, Chair of Logic and Psychology) points out in his letter, the various aspects of interaction between man and technology, and science and production have been already studied in the fields of physiology, hygiene, labor psychology, and other sciences. The results of these studies have been extensively applied in our country in a system

of scientific organization of labor, improved safety equipment, and medical-prophylactic measures. However, the partial measures aimed at labor safety and improved organization do not always yield results satisfactory in terms of modern production.

Quite similar to that letter is the letter by G. M. Zarakovskiy which provides data on sociological studies indicating, for example, that sometimes violations of labor safety rules are due to the lack of proper coordination among technical, psycho-physiological, and social labor factors. This problem can be resolved only with the systematic study of the equipment used, the production environment, and the psychological, social, and other factors, and through the development of expedient algorithms of labor production operations, and further rationalization of the equipment and the production environment with a view to their maximal adaptation to human possibilities and need for creative toil.

The authors consider necessary the formulation of a uniform system of ergonomic production support to replace the current poorly interacting labor safety systems at enterprises and safety services and scientific organization of labor. This would enable us to resolve more economically and productively the problem of planning and optimizing labor processes. Furthermore, in the opinion of both writers, all design institutes working on "man-machine" systems should as of now, in addition to designing technological processes, draft labor operation designs. The latter should be considered separate production elements (one work place and one "man-machine" system), as well as to technical complexes (technological line, shop, and so on). In his letter on the same problems, E. P. Grigor'yev (Central Scientific Research and Design-Experimental Institute of Automated Systems in Construction) notes that the elaboration of theoretical problems of inter-disciplinary research has fallen behind the practice of ergonomic design. The designing of new types of labor activities, of more effectient methods for interaction between man and nature, and so on, is, according to the author, an important stimulating factor for the further and deeper synthesis of scientific knowledge.

The letter by V. M. Munipov (All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Industrial Esthetics) deals with ergonomic possibilities and prospects in terms of designing and theoretical study of problems of labor rationalization.

Ergonomy, the author points out, considers man, machine, and production environment as a complex operational entity in which man plays the leading role. It studies above all the role of human factors in modern production (and other realms of activities), and integral characteristics of man-machine interaction. The author particularly emphasizes that research in the field of ergonomy could not be reduced to individual or even overall characteristics of people, machines, and production environments. Ergonomy as a science, must, clearly, develop its own theory and formulate its own specific methods for the study of the "man-technology-production environment."

A comprehensive approach to the problem of human labor activities in accordance with data of the social, natural, and technical sciences, would enable us to see in a different light a number of theoretical and practical problems. Such an approach would lead to the accurate assessment not only of the role of labor tools and technical facilities, and the real significance of the factors effecting the production environment, but the proper place of man in contemporary public production. As the author notes, the labor quality category assumes a new meaning as well. Economists single out, above all, characteristics such as complexity (skill), intensiveness, difficulty, conditions, national economic significance, and other labor factors. These characteristics are also considered in wage rating. However, the social effectiveness of labor activities is not made sufficiently apparent in this case. A study of labor qualities from the exclusive viewpoint of strictly economic criteria does not reflect adequately labor specifics under developed socialist conditions. "The quality of labor," V. M. Mumipov points out, "is an integral characteristics of a given type of activity which encompasses the indicators of quality and quantity of output in terms of raw material outlays and the psychological and physiological "price" of the work, as well as in terms of health and intellectual development of the individual." The fullest possible satisfaction of the human need for creative activities for the stage reached by scientific and technical progress should be the main criterion for the optimum interaction between man and machines.

At the present stage the integration among social, natural, and technical sciences indicates the need for engineers, designers, and specialists in the field of cybernetics to take thoroughly into consideration social, ecological, and other "human factors" in the structure of output, services, and other areas. Technological improvements and their effective use in the national economy are among the most important tasks of scientific and technical progress, as stipulated in the Basic Directions in the Development of the USSR National Economy in 1976-1980, and the solution of this problem largely depends on the level of the development of the social and humanitarian sciences.

The letter by V. M. Andryushchenko and I. A. Butin (Moscow State University Department of Economics Computer Laboratory for Humanity Departments) states that the exceptional complexity of systems involving man requires research methods substantially different from those of traditional physical-mathematical analysis. The use of linguistic facilities in modeling such systems, i.e., the use not only of figures but words and even prepositions of a natural language is quite promising. The possibilities of modern science to provide a comprehensive solution to problems of information interaction between man and computer is discussed, in relation to the editorial, by Yu. G. Kosarev (USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department Institute of Mathematics) and V. I. Perebeynos (Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Linguistics imeni A. A. Potebni). They point out the need for a profound study of the natural language for such purposes, using modern formal methods, and discuss the practical importance of this work to resolving problems of production automation.

Furthermore, the profound study of the natural language and the laws governing its structure and functioning would facilitate the solution of some technical problems: Upgrading the quality and operativeness of the mass press, and the automation of a number of editorial-publishing processes (editing, proofing, and so on).

In order to accelerate scientific and technical progress and develop effective control systems, an ever greater volume of information must be processed with every passing year and at an ever growing speed. The participation of linguists in improving production and social processes with the help of a computer is expressed today in a linguistically new research method--specific modeling of a linguistic system and of speech processes. The results of such modeling are materialized in the special artificial languages and various linguistic algorithms. A particularly refined modeling of speech activities would be required in the elaboration of dialogue-type systems and other promising methods for man-machine interaction.

Applied linguistics must make its own contribution to substantially improving the parameters and upgrading the effectiveness of all systems using natural languages. It must give computers access to information in its natural form without its preliminary human processing. We must design the type of computers which could operate in semantic terms (rather than superficial text units). We must drastically increase the volume of information participating in the solution of intellectual problems and develop new possibilities for its complex logical processing.

The problems listed in the letters are merely a small part of the problems appearing in this area to which Soviet scientists pay most serious attention. The successful solution of applied linguistics problems with the close interaction of representatives of the different sciences is being achieved, for example, at the All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technical Information of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Science and Technology and USSR Academy of Sciences, the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Cybernetics, the All-Union Center for the Translation of Scientific and Technical Publications and Documents of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Science and Technology and USSR Academy of Sciences, and Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev Universities. The already mentioned letters by Yu. G. Kosarev and V. I. Perebenos describe interesting experience gained in cooperation in this area among the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistics imeni A. A. Potebni, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Cybernetics, USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department Institute of Mathematics, Moscow State University imeni M. V. Lomonosov, Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Cybernetics, and Minsk Foreign Languages Pedagogical Institute. Contacts with scientists in CEMA-member countries are being maintained in this area.

It is clear that many members of a great variety of professions need a basic knowledge of modern linguistics. This requires corresponding organizational methods. Rich opportunities are found in the universities which could play

an important role in developing the alliance between linguistics, on the one hand, and philosophy, logic, psychology, mathematics, programming, management theory, theory of information, theory of gains, theory of coding, and other scientific disciplines, on the other. In this connection theoretical seminars attended by specialists in different fields assume a major role. Their practical experience should be seriously studied and summed up by the scientific press. Extensive contacts among scientists in various fields alone could provide effective solutions to problems raised by the scientific and technical revolution in our country.

Of late production automation and many other matters related to social and scientific and technical progress have required the thorough study of people. The more difficult the tasks and the more complex the processes to be automated, the more urgent becomes the problem of the study of man in the entire variety of his personality, including social qualities.

The most important problem that emerges here is that of studying human activities. The level of its development presently determines the solution of many most important practical and scientific problems. Yet, as V. P. Zinchenko, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences corresponding member (Moscow State University Psychology Department, Chair of Labor and Engineering Psychology) points in his letter, the interaction among sciences in the study of this complex problem has not reached as yet the necessary depth. The author points out considerable differences and difficulties in the interpretation of the concept of human activity itself and in the choice of a base for the classification of its types, and of adequate methods for its study under laboratory and natural conditions, in comparing data obtained through different methods and in comparing such data with results of philosophical studies.

In the author's view a serious philosophical interpretation of the nature of human activities and thinking is particularly necessary in resolving problems related to their modeling. Modern computers could imitate, as the author points out, merely the operational-technical functions of human thought. Yet, the procedures followed in machine and human actions are basically different (not to mention differences in mechanisms). Such a structurally complex process can not be reduced to logical-mathematical structures.

The efforts to model the elements in the organization of thought processes are highly useful. Yet, the author notes, there are no grounds whatever for enthusiasm for an exhaustive modeling of the human mind, the creation of a complete "artificial intellect," a "hybrid intellect," and so on. computers could substantially facilitate, accelerate, and raise the accuracy of decision making. However, they could equally accelerate the making of wrong decisions. In this connection both social and technical sciences face extremely interesting problems of organizing and designing human activities integrated with automation means (ranging from basic to most complex and more advanced compared with those presently extent).

As Ye. A. Aleksandrov (Scientific Research Institute for Designing Computer Centers and Economic Information Systems) points in his letter, difficulties and errors in the elaboration of control systems and the creation of means of automation and automated control systems stem precisely from the insufficiently attentive attitude regarding social science data. The author writes that developers have not always given priority to profound economic processes developing in a sector, association, or enterprise in elaborating a number of departmental automated control systems. The formulation of the main problems of controlling the socialist economic management system, such as scientific forecasting, management of scientific and technical progress, and so on, have been replaced by a number of secondary problems of an essentially recording nature. This has led to duplicating the widespread network of the USSR Central Statistical Administration. This is understandable, for here, as in production work, automation presently effects only the simplest and most widespread elements in the management of economic units.

The author points out another aspect of the same problem. In the course of efforts to formulate and resolve such management problems developed economic-mathematical models have frequently simplified economic processes to such an extent that the results of the computations failed to provide a substantive interpretation and were skeptically considered by practical workers. The letter emphasizes the need for the most thorough consideration of the contemporary experience of economic managers and economists, and of data acquired by the social sciences on the characteristics of one or another economic or social process and method of managing the socialist economy. The still encountered neglect of practical experience in management and organization and social science data is adversely effecting attempts to automate management and information processes.

The author considers necessary the creation of technical facilities and machine methods for data control and processing suitable to human practical activities and consistent with factual practical experience in the study and forecasting of economic processes and comprehensive management methods already developed. The natural sciences which study adaptation activities and behavior of living organisms could substantially contribute to the implementation of this strategy.

V. V. Chavchanidze, Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences Academician (Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Cybernetics) discusses the significance of inter-disciplinary research for the development of heuristic type programs for work with computers. Presently the purposes of such programs are limited: To duplicate, i.e., to reproduce with the help of computers, certain possibilities of the human mind to resolve problems. Man comes across such problems every minute, as a rule, even not noticing that he is resolving them. The results of studies in this direction, as the author notes, has been so far quite modest. It is already obvious, however, that anything which could be formalized (i.e., which could be translated into a program language) in the realm of the humanities and social practice should be gradually translated into a machine system language as well.

As the author points out in his letter, the need for a cybernetic approach to studies in this field is manifested in connection with the fact that in industrial and commercial systems, in management, in economic-geographic planning, and in the areas of psychology, sociology, and so on, the volume of data and variable factors is quite substantial. In this case conventional physical-mathematical methods prove to be meaningless or, at least, ineffective. It is important to develop the type of models and systems which would enable us to streamline knowledge, classify most complex processes and structures, and establish the main characteristics of social processes using systems analysis, vectorial optimizing, and heuristic methods.

As the author points out in the same letter, the Gosplan, the state statistical service, the sectorial planning and management organs and, in general, all state management services (Ministry of Finance, Glavsnab, and others) have long engaged in such studies and computations in the realm of social practices. However, the methods they use are frequently poorly interrelated. They are empirical, i.e., they rely mainly on a set of formulas developed at different times "properly describing dependencies." The author considers it a serious problem that now, when machine facilities have been developed for storing and depicting the structure of data, scientists do not always have suitable computation methods consistent with the economic-mathematical interpretation of results. As he proves, contacts among cybernetics, mathematics, and the humanities and social sciences could be organized through the reciprocal enrichment of their traditional methods and the elaboration, on this basis, of essentially new research methods.

The thorough study of the specific nature of the social sciences by mathematicians and the scrupulous mastery by the humanitarians of the latest mathematical and cybernetic methods and computer facilities is a difficult yet inevitable task, at least as long as their integration is in its preliminary development stage, i.e., until specialists combining the possibilities of both types of sciences have been trained.

The author further points out that the opinion still prevails that the use of cybernetic and mathematical means of analysis in the realm of the humanities and the social sciences would void the importance of their traditional research methods. Refined, deep, and rich observations, and graphic depictions of the studies conducted by literary workers and historians, art and esthetic specialists, and so on, would lose their value. However, this could occur only as a result of the artificial separation of these different branches in the development of science and culture. The profound dialectical interpretation of such processes shows more complex yet also more optimistic trends. Many humanitarians have already found a common language with specialists in the fields of cybernetics, mathematics, and technology, and are trying to resolve their problems by making creative use of the methods offered by such disciplines as well.

The elaboration of a single terminology for the technical and social sciences plays an important role in synthesizing knowledge, for the effective functioning and improvement of management systems largely depend on

their timely and efficient information support which includes the use of unified documentation systems (USD) and of an integrated system for the classification and coding of technical and economic information (YeSKK). The work done in this direction is described, in connection with the editorial, by A. A. Sakov (All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Technical Information, Classification, and Coding).

At the same time, some of the writers point out the substantial differences in the meanings of identical terms used by the social, natural, and technical sciences, and, in this connection, the need for a thoughtful and careful approach to the elaboration of a uniform terminology and a broader philosophical-methodological study of linguistic problems within each separate scientific area.

Whatever the problems raised in the letters to the editors may be, one way or another they lead the scientists to philosophical summations, facing them with the need to interpret not only particular but conceptual, methodological problems. This is also characteristic of letters discussing environmental protection problems. Describing the ecological problem as a complex one, E. V. Girusov (Moscow State University Natural Sciences Department Chair of Philosophy) emphasizes that at the present stage of ecological development many social, natural, and technical sciences meet. However, the author assumes, it is already clear that their cooperation should lead to the creation of an autonomous theory (or theories) reflecting the specific laws governing the interaction between nature and society, and not reduced to purely biological or purely social laws. The solution of such problems would be inconceivable without the solid methodological base which Marxist-Leninist philosophy provides science.

The author also points out some problems of organizational support of comprehensive scientific research on ecological problems. The creation of problems councils by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Science and Technology, and the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education represents a significant yet insufficient measure for the solution of such problems. The time is ripe, the author writes, for the creation of a scientific institution to study global contemporary problems.

We should note, however, that despite the clearly topical nature of ecological problems and their obvious inter-disciplinary nature, the formulation in the editorial of the problem of interaction among social, natural, and technical sciences for its solution failed, unfortunately, to trigger an extensive discussion among specialists in this field. Yet, the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress directly pointed out the need for a most profound study and discussion of this problem. Obviously, it would be useful for the respective publications to continue this discussion and hear the views of ecologists, economists, physicians, geographers, and power engineers on ways for the development of science in connection with the protection of the environment and the use of power resources in the socialist economy, of architects,

geographers, economists, and sociologists on urban construction problems, of geologists, geographers, and ecologists on the interaction among sciences in resolving problems of the rational utilization of raw material reserves, and so on.

Many other matters related to the interaction among social, natural, and technical sciences, not included in the editorial, should also be submitted to most serious discussions. As we know, the materials of the 25th CPSU Congress drew the attention to the topical nature of problems of developing the material and technical foundations for communism, location of the country's production forces, growth and territorial location of the population, utilization of space around the earth and outer space, and weather forecasting in accordance with the influence of anthropogenic and space factors. This would be inconceivable without the joint efforts of scientists with a great variety of professional interests and without the elaboration of general theoretical and philosophical-methodological foundations for inter-disciplinary research.

A number of letters related to the editorial drew attention to the difficulties encountered by young scientists in defending dissertations on combined inter-disciplinary problems. Research in this field does not always meet with the necessary understanding and support by representatives of basic long developed directions of scientific research. Many authors consider that the attention of the competent institutions and, above all, of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Science and Technology and USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, should be drawn to this. They express the view of the expediency to create under the Higher Certification Commission a special commission of experts on complex problems, and engage more extensively in discussions of such problems involving the participation of specialists in different fields. They discuss the need for the publication of a periodical on "Problems of Inter-Disciplinary Relations."

The editors thanks all journal readers who answered the editorial "Strengthening the Interconnection among Social, Natural, and Technical Sciences," and express their confidence that this exchange of views will be an incentive for the further strengthening of creative cooperation among the sciences.

5003

CSO: 1802

FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST AND ANTI-MONOPOLY FRONT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 70-88

[Article by Kharilaos Florakis, Greek Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; from the 10th Congress of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee Accountability Report (May 1978)]

[Text] Development of Circumstances in the World and in the Eastern Mediterranean

At present the struggle of the people for the solution of their major problems is linked more closely than ever before with the struggle of other peoples and is closely interlinked with the development of the international circumstances.

What are the present international circumstances? Further changes have taken place in the complex development of events in the present world in the ratio of forces in favor of socialism, democracy, national independence, and peace, and to the detriment of imperialism and reaction.

The Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity, whose power and cooperation and role in world politics are growing steadily, played a decisive role in this development of events. The members of the socialist comity are achieving a steady upsurge in the economic, social, and cultural fields, and in the education of the new man. All this opens new prospects and possibilities for development in all fields of life and inspires the struggling peoples.

These socialist successes are having a positive influence both on the development of the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries and the struggle of recently liberated countries, and on the development of the liberation movements against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

For the past four years the capitalist system has been shaken up by one of the most severe economic crises after World War Two, with minor deviations in the different countries. At the same time all aspects of the general crisis of capitalism are intensifying: political, economic, social, spiritual, and moral.

Even the representatives of capitalism acknowledge that in the past four years the economic crisis was the main feature of the economic development of the capitalist world.

This crisis has spread simultaneously to nearly all countries and all economic centers of the capitalist world. It scattered the myth of the defenders of capitalism about a "crisis-free capitalism," proving that the state-monopoly economic management methods are unable to avoid or weaken capitalist contradictions. The crisis intensifies the socio-political instability of the entire capitalist system and leads to the aggravation of its contradictions.

Within that time the fascist dictatorship in Portugal was overthrown and the fascist dictatorships of Greece and Spain fell. The peoples of France, Italy, and other countries are struggling for radical change.

Within the same time other enslaved peoples were liberated from the oppression of imperialism and backwardness--the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, and others. New possibilities arose for the liberation of the remaining peoples of Africa from colonialism and racism. The systems of the Arab and other previously dependent peoples, systems of a progressive nature and even a socialist orientation, are becoming stronger and the role of non-aligned countries in international politics is rising.

The increased power of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and the persistent Leninist policy pursued by the CPSU toward insuring peace the world over were the main factors which insured the success of the policy of detente and peaceful development, a policy supported by all peace-loving forces in the world. This policy is the only alternative to the threat of a thermonuclear war which would represent an unparalleled catastrophe to mankind. We must reemphasize the fact that even though imperialism has been forced to acknowledge the principle of peaceful coexistence this does not mean in the least that its aggressive nature has changed. Feeling that they are losing ground as a result of the development of the peaceful revolutionary movement under the conditions of detente, its most aggressive circles are mounting a counter-attack in order to turn the world back to the cold war which caused so much suffering to the nations. These circles are resisting fiercely.

The process of the intensification of detente is facing its opposite trend as well--the continuation and intensification of the arms race by the imperialist countries. The imperialist circles are also trying to undermine the socialist system from within. In the capitalist world as well these circles are adapting their tactics in such a way as to prevent the people from achieving substantial democratic changes. A newly introduced element is the methodical use of the activities of extremists, allegedly "left-wing" organizations whose ranks they penetrate pursuing their objectives.

The U.S. plans concerning the production and dissemination of the neutron bomb and other new types of weapons are the most vivid example of imperialism's dangerous resistance. Unless the arms race, pursued above all by the United States, fails to come to an end, and unless new ways to disarmament are found, detente may become problematical.

Along with the other nations, the Greek people are concerned by such a tireless increase of armaments. They are concerned with the policy pursued by American imperialism. This concern stems from the fact that Greece is located in the Eastern Mediterranean and is not far from the Middle East which, in connection with the policy pursued by the United States and NATO and the actions of its tool--Israel--remains the permanent epicenter of danger to the cause of the peace in this area and in the rest of the world. This policy is directed against the socialist countries and the national-liberation forces of neighboring countries. This same policy encourages the aggressive intentions of the Turkish chauvinists toward Greece and arms both sides--Turkey and Greece--dangerously aggravating the circumstances. The United States intends, under such circumstances, to secure the strengthening and broadening of the strategic positions of American-NATO imperialism in our rather delicate area and strengthen the control of American imperialism and of other international monopolies over petroleum.

All this proves that the Greek Communist Party must energize its efforts to develop a mass movement for peace and detente which would extend to all people of good will in our country; intensify the struggle for the removal of American-NATO bases and abrogation of demeaning agreements, and for our country's withdrawal from NATO and making the Mediterranean a zone of peace; and expand the struggle for national independence and against imperialist intrigues.

We support the people of Cyprus in their struggle against American-NATO plans and favor a just solution of the Cypriot problem within the framework of the United Nations. We are in favor of the independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus, for the withdrawal of all foreign troops and the return of all refugees to their homes. We are in favor of holding a representative international conference to resolve the Cypriot problem within the frameworks and on the basis of decisions adopted on the problem of Cyprus on the Security Council and United Nations General Assembly.

Concerning the Aegean, we believe that our national borders are sacred and inviolable. We reject all attempts against our national integrity.

We are against chauvinistic declarations made both in Greece and Turkey as well as against the arms race. We believe that the crisis in the Aegean should be settled on the basis of a consideration of the reciprocal interests of both nations and the interests of the peace and respect of national independence and territorial integrity, and without the use of force or the threat of its use--principles also proclaimed in the final act in Helsinki, signed by both Greece and Turkey. The Aegean Sea should be a sea of

peace and peaceful contacts among nations. On this basis the problem of the continental shelf could and should be resolved through peaceful talks and on the basis of international agreements related to maritime law without U.S. and NATO interference.

Our party has assessed as positive the efforts of the Greek government to develop relations with the Balkan socialist countries. Naturally, we know that the doctrine according to which "we belong to the West" erects major obstacles to the development of such relations to their fullest extent and to the development of our relations with the Soviet Union. We know that anti-Sovietism does not surrender easily its positions. However, since we know the help which our people could gain from the support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in resolving major national problems and problems of economic development, as well as in meeting Greece's scientific and technical requirements, we shall promote the greater development of such relations on the basis of the reciprocal benefits to the nations and the interests of the peace.

We are worried about the policy of the Chinese leadership. We are worried about the fact that anti-Soviet orientation remains its main direction. We are worried about the absurd claims that the Soviet Union is, allegedly, "enemy number one" of the Chinese people and the peace. We are concerned about the development of relations between the Chinese leadership and the circles of the aggressive NATO bloc; about the leadership's support of the production of the neutron bomb by the American imperialists; its support of fascist and other reactionary regimes; and the creation and support of extremist organizations in capitalist countries.

A recent manifestation of this policy, directly affecting our country and our area, was the invitation to Peking of a delegation consisting exclusively of representatives of the "New Democracy" rightwing party, and the recommendations it received.

The Chinese leadership recommended to us, i.e., the Greeks, no more and no less than to support U.S. and NATO policy, a policy which is causing infinite suffering to the Greek people; it favored the unification of the Balkan countries against the Soviet Union, and so on. All this obviously benefits the oppressors of our people and, naturally, trigger the people's indignation. The Chinese leadership has repeatedly rejected offers by the Soviet Union to initiate talks on normalizing intergovernmental relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. Everyone clearly realizes that imperialism and the enemies of the peace alone benefit from such a policy. We hope that, in the final account, common sense will prevail within the Communist Party of China, which will be consistent with the interests of the peace and the anti-imperialist struggle waged by the peoples, including the people of Greece.

The international communists and workers' movement, the most influential force of our time, was a decisive factor in promoting further changes in the world. The Greek Communist Party tried to strengthen its relations with all

fraternal parties in the socialist and capitalist countries, particularly in Europe, with AKEL,¹ the Communist Party of Turkey, and other parties. The party also established contacts with the liberation and progressive parties of Middle Eastern and African countries. It has done everything within its power to defend the principles of Marxism-Leninism and rally the ranks of the international communist movement. It took part in the conference of communist and workers' parties of Europe in Berlin; it organized extensive actions of solidarity between the Greek people and the peoples of Palestine, Chile, and other countries fighting imperialism and neo-fascism. In turn, our people are enjoying the support and solidarity of other peoples in the struggle against imperialism and the local oligarchy. Our party remains inflexibly loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism. It considers the principle of autonomy and equality among communist and workers' parties a basic structural part of proletarian internationalism, inseparable from its other parts.

The party is formulating its line in accordance with the conditions and characteristics of the country on the basis of the common Marxist-Leninist principles and the national and international aspects.

For the Victory of Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Monopoly Democratic Forces and the Establishment of a Democratic System

The implementation of the policy supported by the Greek Communist Party and the establishment of a democratic regime will not be a gift presented by someone within the country or on the outside. It will not come by itself as the result of the intensified contradictions between the monopolies and imperialism, on the one hand, and the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces, on the other. It will be the result of the activities of the alliance among anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic forces, whose vanguard will be the working class. It will be the result of the struggle waged by our party as well as of all parties and organizations accepting the essence of a program for a democratic system for the people. It will be the result of the adamant efforts and severe struggle waged by such forces.

On the basis of the objective assessment of present reality in Greece and its specific aspects, and constructively using the experience of the Greek and international revolutionary movements, our congress must provide an answer to a number of strategic questions: How to concentrate the forces needed for the victory of a people's democracy? What system to follow in order to concentrate them? What should be their structure? How to make them able to surmount the resistance of the ruling class and its foreign supporters? How will they assume the power? The correct answer to these questions is one of the necessary prerequisites for the implementation of this historical task.

The establishment of an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly democracy for the people must be a revolutionary change in the course of our search for the basic criterion for the solution of the various problems.

Its revolutionary nature is determined, above all, regardless of the needs for its accomplishment, by the changes which will take place in the class holding the power and the radical social, economic, and political changes proclaimed in their programs. This means that our answers to the already raised questions or the questions which will arise in the course of the struggle must be based on the laws of the revolution discovered by the classics of Marxism-Leninism, confirmed by international revolutionary practice, and totally consistent with our reality and our national characteristics. They alone could provide a proper guarantee of the accuracy of the theoretical and practical solution to various problems in the interest of the revolution, the working class, and all working people in our country.

Another clear aspect should be the fact that the implementation of a program for a people's democracy would be meaningless unless we resolve "the basic problem of any revolution," i.e., the problem of state power. This means that the party must direct its work toward acquiring such a prerequisite.

Finally, we must have a clear and full idea of both factual possibilities and favorable factors and difficulties.

We understand that each of these stages within the single revolutionary process has its difficulties created by the nature of problems to be resolved. However, since we have been called upon to implement the task of an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, democratic change we must particularly emphasize here the difficulties which we shall encounter at this stage. We should have no illusions. Naturally, the basic problems to be resolved at this stage, such as the problems of national independence, democracy, and depriving the monopolies of power, interest and affect considerably larger masses compared with problems of the socialist stage. This applies to some of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie as well and is an important favorable factor even though it should not lead us to the conclusion that this is an "easier" aspect, for a number of other factors exist which determine the particular difficulties of this stage. It is at this stage of the single revolutionary process that the main struggle for power will take place between the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic forces, on the one hand, and the monopoly oligarchy, on the other. The ruling class knows that the single revolutionary process is not a fabrication by our party but an objective process of conversion from anti-imperialist change to socialism. This class knows very well that when the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic forces, headed by the working class, seize the power, the local monopolies of national importance will be nationalized and that a radical revolutionary reorganization of the state apparatus will take place. As a whole, this will seriously weaken, economically, and politically, the monopolistic oligarchy.

We must also bear in mind the fact that with the establishment of a people's democracy a number of hesitating population strata will take the side of the revolution. The other progressive forces, now idle for a variety of reasons, will become active as well.

All this makes it clear that with the victory of a people's democracy a new ratio of forces will develop adverse to the monopolistic oligarchy but favoring the progress of revolutionary forces toward socialism.

Naturally, we do not mean in the least that following the victory of a people's democracy the monopolistic oligarchy will not desperately try to regain the power and that, consequently, the problem of reserving, strengthening, and further developing the revolutionary system will not meet with difficulties or demand constant attention.

The only thing we wish to say is that since the oligarchy knows that should it lose the battle for power in the first stage and find itself, subsequently, in an adverse condition, and will fight on the basis of weakened positions with a view to neutralizing the process of progress toward socialism, naturally, it will do everything possible not to lose the power.

The same will apply to international imperialism. Following the victory of the people's democracy, its economic, political, and military positions in our country will be eliminated and our dependence on it will come to an end. Greece will not be its bridgehead. This fact proves that imperialism will offer all possible help within the conditions of the domestic and international ratio of forces to the Greek monopolistic oligarchy to retain its domination and hinder the withdrawal of Greece from its orbit.

Unquestionably, this aid will hinder the struggle for power of the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic forces.

Naturally, our only purpose in mentioning this is not simply to depict the scale of the difficulties in the first stage but most firmly emphasize the need to focus our efforts on the struggle for surmounting them. We believe that reality itself will give us all grounds to manifest our total confidence in the fact that all these efforts, whatever their scale, will be crowned with success in the final account.

Winning Over the Majority of the Working People

The struggle for surmounting such difficulties means, above all, the waging of a daily comprehensive struggle for winning over the majority of the working people in favor of the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly people's democracy. This possibility exists, for the overwhelming majority of Greek classes and strata (workers, peasants, petit bourgeoisie) are in a state of more or less antagonistic conflict with the monopolistic bourgeoisie and imperialism.

Let us clarify that by such a majority we mean not an accidental majority, a simple parliamentary majority which could be largely the product of a temporary expression of protest. It would be a tragic illusion for us to believe that a revolutionary change could be accomplished with the support of such a majority.

In a revolutionary period, V. I. Lenin said, it is insufficient "to establish 'the will of the majority.'" No, one must prove to be stronger at the decisive moment, and the decisive place. One must win" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 34, p 40). As shown by this statement and confirmed by reality, in order to accomplish such a change we need not only quantity but the necessary quality. We need the type of majority which would represent a unity of organizations and mass movements enjoying a wide influence. Such a majority, whose structural components would be--naturally, in different degrees--raised in the struggle, would be aware of the need for radical change and be ready to make its possible contribution to the struggle, ranging from active participation to simple material and moral support. In other words, we shall require the type of majority which would have not only the desire but the ability to win and to consolidate its victory. It is precisely the creation and tempering of such a majority that is today the basic strategic task of the Greek Communist Party.

A Vital Question

Priority is given to a vital question: What specific type of organizational form could such a majority acquire, and how to implement the strategic task of concentrating and uniting such forces?

Our revolutionary movement has rich experience in achieving unity of action and creating alliances of political forces for the purpose of reaching common objectives. We have the experience of the popular front, EAM [National Liberation Front], the United Democratic Left (EDA), and cases of cooperation on other occasions in reaching limited objectives in pre-dictatorial times.

This experience shows that the unity among such forces must be promoted from below as well, by rallying the working people for the solution of anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic problems and, from above, by reaching agreements with other political forces and parties. This experience also teaches that, regardless of the forms of expression of such unity (bloc, alliance, and so on), it must be expressed in the united front of anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic forces.

The creation of such a front would be the result of an adamant struggle which must be waged in all fields of work and at different levels. Unity from below, unity of action among members and supporters of all mass organizations and movements, coordination of the activities of the various mass organizations and progressive movements, and their merger within a single stream must be the main direction to be followed in the struggle for creating a front of people's democratic forces.

Organizing and directing the struggle of the working people for the solution of their daily problems, for improving their economic situation, and for repelling the offensive of the government and the monopolies against the trade union and democratic rights, closely linked with the general political problems of the country, in such a way as to raise the masses in a militant

spirit, freeing them from anti-communist prejudices and influences, enhancing their political consciousness, and helping them to understand the need for the establishment of a front of struggle for overthrowing the power of the monopolies and establishing a people's democracy, must be foundation of the development of such unity from below.

The joint struggle waged by the working people for the solution of their vital problems must be waged in such a way as to achieve the best possible results on each separate occasion. This is of tremendous importance, for the more effective the struggle becomes the more confident will the working people become in their joint efforts, and the more will their unity strengthen and broaden.

Such an effectiveness could be secured by formulating realistic demands and utilizing all forms of struggle for the satisfaction of such demands while, at the same time, decisively opposing any compromising opportunistic trends and extreme leftwing actions. With every passing day reality proves that the immediate interests of the working people can not be met without a struggle against rightwing and leftwing opportunism, not to speak of the building of their anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly unity on solid foundations.

Working Class Unity

Assuming the entire burden of the struggle for the creation of an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly front from below, our party is directing its efforts above all toward the unity of action among the working class--the leading force of this front. This direction is dictated by the familiar fact that working class unity is the basic postulate for broad combat unity. Unless the working class itself, in its majority, is not united, the struggle for uniting all working people would not rest on solid foundations. Unless such a struggle is successful the working class would be unable to perform its leading role, for this role demands allies. Consequently, the struggle for unity within the working class means, in the final account, a struggle for the creation of conditions enabling it to implement this historical task.

The creation of an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly front of struggle for a people's democracy, headed by the working class, naturally, largely depends on the attitude of the working class toward the just demands of the toiling masses. Supporting such demands through action, and assisting by all possible means the struggle for their satisfaction, the working class gains the trust of all working people, develops combat solidarity with them and thus unifies them. Let us reemphasize that the more united the working class is the better it will struggle for the solution of problems effecting all working people and, consequently, the more actively will it participate in the creation of a people's democratic front.

In this connection we must take into consideration the fact that in some cases certain differences in terms of interests arise between the working class and other working people who must participate, together with the working class, in the front of the struggle for a people's democracy. Such

differences do not effect fundamental problems. They are of a temporary non-antagonistic nature. This enables us to settle such differences to the detriment of the common enemy of all working people--the monopolies. Therefore, the direct interests of the working people will not be harmed and their unity will strengthen.

A major increase in the influence of our party among the toiling masses and, above all, winning over the majority of the working class, is the basic prerequisite for the creation of an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly front. All of us must clearly understand that without such increase in party influence and without a corresponding development of its organized forces the creation of a front for a people's democracy would remain a pious wish. This puts even more emphatically on the agenda the problem of carrying out our present tasks in the field of party construction and the need to go to the masses decisively and to energize political and explanatory work within them.

On the Level of the Political Parties

As it develops from below, the unity among anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic forces will have a decisive influence on the establishment of a front for a people's democracy from above as well, on the level of the political parties. It is self-evident that since this front will be of a purely anti-monopoly nature, this line can not fail to indicate the desire of our party to form an alliance with other political forces representing social strata and groups which, by their very nature, are interested in overthrowing the domination of the monopolies and establishing an anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly democracy. Such political forces are the parties and groups operating within the broad range of leftwing forces. Today, objectively, PASOK² is objectively part of these forces. This determines not only its social base but its basic anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly positions.

Obstacles

Naturally, we must mention that achieving such an alliance is no easy task. The road to it is crowded with obstacles and adamant efforts will be required to surmount them.

a. Ideological Differences

This obstacle as, in fact, all other, is not insurmountable. We do not demand of anyone to adopt our ideology in order to form an alliance with us. However, nor do the alliances we offer presume the elimination of such ideological differences. All political forces operating within the broad range of leftwing forces are formulating today more or less common political objectives. All of them formulate, one way or another, and to one extent or another, the demand of rescuing the country from foreign dependence, the elimination of the power of foreign monopolies, and the democratic reorganization of all aspects of social life. These same demands, whose implementation would be consistent with the implementation of the tasks of the

anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic change, could be the basis of a program for an alliance among leftwing parties and groups. We should not forget that the alliance we offer stipulates the preservation of the parties' organizational and ideological autonomy. Consequently, our party will have the possibility to try to convince the working people of the rightness of its ideology.

b. The Question of a Leader of the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Monopoly Alliance

The different concepts concerning the leadership of the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly alliance, occasionally used as a reason for refusal to cooperate, is one of the obstacles on the path to achieving the unity of anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly forces. We consider this obstacle groundless.

In the alliance of anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly forces whose creation and, even more so, whose consolidation would be possible only on the basis of total equality, one of these equal forces would be the vanguard, would be the first among equals.

We are confident, and have always proclaimed it, that in such an alliance the leading role would legitimately belong to the working class. This is objectively determined by its position within the present social production system. the working class is the carrier of socialist relations in the production area, for which reason it can not fail to be interested more than all other classes and population strata in the systematic and precise implementation of anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly changes, since it is such changes that lead to socialism in the course of the single revolutionary process. Who could seriously claim that the working class in our country is not the best organized and the most militant power? What other class has such rich experience in the social and political struggle?

Such is our common position on this problem, confirmed by reality. However, such a basic position should not become a practical obstacle, for we have never formulated as a condition for cooperating with other parties their preliminary acknowledgment of the leading role of the working class. We are also well aware of the fact that no one intends to grant this role to the working class. It would gain it itself, by making proper political decisions, engaging in effective activities, and invariably fighting in the leading ranks regardless of the casualties. That is precisely why we deem it our duty to help the working class not only to become aware of its leading role but factually to prove its ability to perform it.

In resolving this problem we are guided by the spirit of Lenin's instructions according to which a simple repetition of the word "class" is insufficient in proving the role of the proletariat as the revolutionary vanguard. Consequently, our statements on the leading role of the working class are in the sense that it alone possess the qualities required for

playing such a role and that when the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly cooperation has been achieved, the working class should be able to prove this in the course of the joint struggle in order to be able to gain this role.

Our party will dedicate all possible efforts to surmount these and other similar obstacles. It will invariably and constructively criticize individual aspects of the policies of the other leftwing forces with which it disagrees. It will tirelessly work to surmount existing prejudices in order to create a climate of trust needed in organizing on the upper levels the front of the struggle for a people's democracy.

It is self-evident that the creation of such a front would depend not only on our efforts but on the positions of the other political leftwing forces. We would like to hope that their positions would be of a positive nature. In any case, the creation of such a front is an objective need. For this reason the Greek Communist Party believes that, in the final account, it will become possible, regardless of difficulties, either with the participation of today's leftwing parties, or their groups or the development of new political combinations.

The various representatives of the monopolies have always erected obstacles on the path of the struggle for unity among leftwing political forces. Their efforts will become energized as the struggle grows. This is inevitable, for it is determined by the interests of the monopolies. The only meaning of the attacks mounted by the monopoly oligarchy against the unity of leftwing parties lies in the proof provided by our opponents of the extent to which this unity is consistent with the interests of the toiling people and is necessary. Consequently, any leftwing political leader who would truly wish to draw conclusions from the policy of intimidation promoted by the monopolistic oligarchy on the subject of unity among leftwing political forces, could not act other than by answering it by energizing his efforts aimed at reaching such unity.

c. The Alliance between Workers and Peasants

The alliance between workers and peasants, which is one of the most important and invariable objectives of our policy, must be the base of the front of the struggle for a people's democracy. We are trying to hammer out this alliance by working in two directions. The first and main direction is the development of Greek Communist Party forces in the province; the second is cooperation within the framework of the struggle for a people's democracy with the political supporters of the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist line enjoying an influence among the different peasant strata. One of these bearers is the National Agrarian Party which firmly supports the principle of a worker-peasant alliance.

In the course of the pre-congress discussion some comrades questioned whether or not the objective possibility for the creation of an autonomous peasant party existed in our country at present. We know that in the past

the agrarian movement in our country was politically expressed through the National Agrarian Party which was the ally of the Greek Communist Party particularly within the framework of the national resistance. We could say today that within the peasantry and within the framework of the struggle for the solution of its problems, as we believe, there is an area which could be filled by the National Agrarian Party, bearing in mind its rich combat traditions, operating as an autonomous and independent party.

Naturally, the problem of developing the forces of the National Agrarian Party is its own problem. As to us, we would positively consider any step in this direction and would like to establish close cooperation with it on an autonomous and equal basis.

d. Cooperation among Democratic Forces

Fighting for unification and unity of all anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces from top to bottom, and for the establishment of a people's democracy, our party does not limit itself to this alone. We do not ignore the fact that specific problems of democracy exist in whose immediate solution some bourgeois political forces are interested, along with leftwing forces. Nor do we ignore the fact that such forces oppose the rightwing government and reaction, the activities of neo-fascist elements, the authoritarian regime, and a number of other aspects of the "New Democracy" government.

We can not remain indifferent to the fact that the broad democratic masses and their political representatives demand immediate changes in the current situation.

For these reasons our party favors broad democratic cooperation with all democratic opposition parties and groups who oppose the rightwing government and, to one or another extent, are against the "New Democracy" policy, a policy of national subordination and authoritarianism.

Our party is ready to cooperate with the bourgeois opposition democratic forces to remove the rightwing from power on the basis of a program which, to the extent of the possible, would lead to national autonomy, pursuit of an independent foreign policy of peace and cooperation with all states and nations, elimination of reactionary groups in the army and state apparatus, decisive suppression of the activities of the neo-fascists, democratization of social life, restriction of the rule of local and foreign monopolies, and improvements in the situation of the working people. It is clear that such a democratic cooperation, both from the viewpoint of the participation of political forces and of objectives, would be different from anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly unity. Democratic cooperation is a type of joint action with the participation of bourgeois democratic political forces, whose target can not be the elimination of monopoly power and imperialist rule. We are faced with an objective not exceeding the framework of monopoly power. Nevertheless, the implementation of a program for such cooperation would mark a considerable step forward. It would lead to a change in the political situation toward democratic development and improve the conditions and prerequisites for the struggle for achieving the strategic objective of our revolutionary movement.

It is precisely through this lense that we consider democratic cooperation as a policy which, for the sake of meeting the immediate interests of the people and the country, could make a contribution to the anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly front and the struggle for a people's democracy. Any other approach to democratic cooperation or its conversion into the basic target of our struggle would essentially mean dooming the revolutionary movement to the permanent restrictive frameworks of a monopoly state.

e. Democratic Changes

We have always favored democratic changes and have struggled for their implementation in all fields, believing that we should not postpone for tomorrow that which the people could gain today within the framework of a bourgeois system. We also know that such changes are objectively directed, to one or another extent, against the monopolies and imperialism and that, compared with the past, today they could develop extensively. However, we are aware of the true significance of the role which the struggle for such changes plays.

From our viewpoint this struggle could bring about the solution of a number of problems facing the country and the people and, at the same time, contribute to the revolutionary enlightenment of the masses, the gaining of positions by the revolutionary movement in all realms, and the improvement of overall conditions for achieving our direct strategic objective.

The leaders of the so-called Greek Communist Party (Internal)³ consider that reforms are the way gradually leading to an anti-monopoly democracy and socialism. They speak of the possibility for implementing profound structural changes of an anti-monopoly and democratic nature which, step by step, would weaken the power of the monopolistic oligarchy and are, allegedly, today the only way leading to its overthrow. They describe this path as "democratic." We reject this viewpoint as radically wrong. We believe that as long as monopoly power exists such radical changes can not be implemented, for they are revolutionary in nature and, as Marxism-Leninism and reality itself teach us, revolutionary socioeconomic changes could be accomplished only after the seizure of the power by revolutionary forces. Under the conditions of monopoly rule the only democratic changes possible are those which improve the conditions of the struggle for the overthrow of this rule. Furthermore, such democratic gains are necessarily unstable precisely because of the existence of monopoly power which, in a combination of forces in their favor, would try to eliminate them. Hence our task is to struggle for democratic changes possible under the present system while indicating to the working people the need for radical revolutionary changes and the ways leading to their implementation.

Ways for the Assumption of Power by Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Monopoly, and Democratic Forces

It would be not exaggeration to say that the viewpoint on this matter, formulated in the Central Committee Theses, has become the subject of universal attention and triggered a great variety of reactions. It was comprehensively and most seriously discussed by the party membership and its friends and supporters.

It was subjected to all possible distortions and to fierce attacks on the part of our enemies. This is understandable, for it is indeed a question of a very serious matter.

The respective reaction of the bourgeois press proved, yet once again, the extent of the distortions and hypocrisy to which the reaction may resort in its attempts to mislead the people, and turn black into white with a view to preserving its domination.

We know that a number of rightwing press organs have repeatedly stated that should the communists and their allies gain the majority in parliamentary elections, they would not be allowed to assume the power. This factually means that an attempt to suppress the will of the people through naked violence will take place.

Now, when we call upon the working people always to bear in mind the fact that, with imperialist support, the monopolistic oligarchy could resort to the use of arms to protect its power despite the will of the people, and that such an action would make it necessary for them to use violent forms of struggle to remove the monopolistic oligarchy from power, those same printed organs shriek that, allegedly, the communists support civil war and are in favor of blood letting and destruction.

This hypocrisy displayed by the bourgeois press does not amaze us in the least. Nor are we amazed by its appeals to suppress the will of the people, for all of us well know that the bourgeoisie speaks of the "people's sovereignty" but means its own sovereignty. It speaks of "universal democracy," yet means a democracy serving it alone and existing only to the extent to which this does not endanger its power. Nor are we amazed by these attacks mounted against us, for we also well know that the bourgeoisie tries to conceal from the people behind such hypocritical shouts the fact that it is the bearer of violence, basing its system on the variety of forms of violence and not shying at bloodshed for the sake of safeguarding its power should it face the danger of its overthrow, calling foreign forces to its aid as well.

We do not forget the cases of repeated manifestations of a sharp class struggle in our country, for, despite such hypocritical moans on the part of the ruling class, we have kept telling the working people that they must be ideologically and politically prepared should the monopolistic oligarchy and the imperialists force them to choose the path of violence.

On the other hand, nor do we forget the fact that the peaceful way is fully consistent with the interests of the working people and the humaneness of their ideals. That is precisely why we proclaim in our theses that, guided by our theory, we shall do everything in our power for the peaceful way to prevail.

The struggle for creating prerequisites for a peaceful way includes the development of explanatory work so that the broadest possible circle of the armed forces realize the vital need to respect the will of the people. Our soldiers, and democratically leaning officers and non-commissioned officers must play a very important role in insuring this respect. Our position on the ways to power is radically different from the position of the extreme leftwing and the rightwing revisionists. This difference was manifested quite some time ago and quite energetically in the discussion of the Central Committee Theses for our congress.

The extreme leftwing absolutizes the path of the armed struggle, rejecting the idea of a peaceful way, and characterizing as opportunism the claim that in addition to the possibility for an armed struggle there objectively exists the possibility for the creation of prerequisites for a peaceful way, for forcing the ruling class to obey the will of the people without the use of arms. Such leftwingers should be classified among the "hasty," among those who would like to eliminate difficulties "once and for all."

We consider that by adopting this stand the extreme leftwing objectively helps the ruling class to conceal the fact that it alone, by virtue of its social nature, is the carrier of the most naked violence. Furthermore, we consider as criminal madness the desire to resort to armed forms of struggle should conditions allowing the seizure of power by the people through peaceful means develop. Naturally, many difficulties may be found along the peaceful way. Many efforts must be made and many obstacles surmounted. This too is a revolutionary way, the way of the acute class struggle. We must not ignore the necessity of creating, along with everything else, the type of superiority of forces in favor of the revolutionary movement which, as the theses emphasize, would "paralyze the reaction and force it to abandon any idea of an armed resistance to the will of the people." However, this would require efforts and sacrifices.

Conversely, the rightwing revisionists reject any possibility for armed struggle, absolutizing the peaceful way which, furthermore, they interpret in a most opportunistic manner. That is why they accuse us not only of not excluding the possibility of a violent way but also of considering the peaceful way within the framework of our revolutionary strategy as a means for the seizure of power by the working power. Today, they say, it is not a question of a peaceful or violent way within the framework of a strategy of face to face confrontation but of whether or not this way is democratic or undemocratic. Naturally, they consider our way "undemocratic," whereas their way, i.e., the way of gradual changes within the limits of parliamentary procedures would be "democratic" and, naturally, "truly Greek."

We answer such revisionist attacks as follows: We do not exclude the violent way, for we have not forgotten the lessons of the past or the present words and actions of the ruling class, not to speak of its inclination to use armed force. We do not forget this, as they do, for should we forget we would disarm the people politically and doom it forever to capitalist rule. We

include the peaceful way in our revolutionary strategy, for like the violent way it calls for revolutionary changes and the removal of the oligarchy from power, and is based on a powerful and organized mass movement capable of imposing its will on the ruling class.

Let us also emphasize that at the point when either of these two ways would require the active participation and many-faceted contribution of the majority of the people, one way or another, to us the seizure of power by the working people would mean obeying the will of the majority. It will be the product and expression of a truly popular power and, consequently, a truly democratic action, the more so since it would be directed against the violence of a reactionary minority and would bring about a democracy which, from all viewpoints, would be incomparably higher than any other type of democracy. Consequently, to us both the peaceful and violent ways are democratic.

As to the revisionist views on the evolutionary transition to an anti-monopolistic democracy and to socialism, despite the fact that they describe it as the "democratic" and "Greek" way, it is no way at all for the simple reason that it could not bring about revolutionary change. This social democratic concept has been long tried and, as practical experience has indicated, brings all kinds of results other than the establishment of a people's system.

Let us now consider the final aspect of the matter. In the course of the pre-congress discussion some comrades expressed the opinion that the theses mainly emphasized the peaceful way. Others, conversely, claimed that the violent way is emphasized whereas others again, in accordance with their views suggested that in all cases we should emphasize one of the two ways.

It is proper for the theses not to give preference to either of the two. We believe that the opposite would be an error. The theses emphasize that "the final choice of the way will depend on the international and domestic circumstances, the ratio of forces at the time of the decisive confrontation, and the means which the local monopolistic oligarchy and international imperialism will use against the people's movement." It is self-evident that today we can not know the future development of such factors. That is precisely why we could not say today which of the two ways would be the most likely. Were we to proclaim as of today one or another way it would be the equivalent of rejecting Lenin's concept that the forms of struggle are chosen in accordance with the specific circumstances and would be the equivalent of underestimating or absolutizing the enemy's behavior. Our position, however, does not mean that we would remain neutral observers, waiting for the moment of crisis in order to determine our position. Nor should we ignore the fact that the ruling class does not intend to obey the will of the majority, something which has been repeatedly confirmed in our country. We should not underestimate our own role in shaping the factors which would prevent the enemy from resorting to armed violence.

Should the enemy decide to do so, in the final account, we must be ready to oppose him. That is why our task is to apply all our efforts to the organization of a powerful mass movement and prepare it ideologically, politically, and organizationally so that it may be able to use the forms of struggle which would become factually necessary and effective.

Using the rich experience gained in the class battles in our country and creatively applying Marxism-Leninism in the specific conditions of Greek reality, our party is seeking the specific ways to anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, and democratic changes and ways of transition to socialism.

This has nothing to do with the "modernization" or "renovation" experienced by rightwing and "leftwing" revisionism.

The Party's Ideological Work

A certain upsurge was noted in the party's ideological and propaganda work in the period following the Ninth Congress. After the July changes⁴ the legal publication of party printed matter began. The circulation of the newspaper RIZOSPASTIS, the organ of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee, is increasing and its quality is improving. The ideological and theoretical standard of the journal KOMMOUNISTIKI EPITHEORISIS has improved and its circulation has expanded considerably as well. The journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, in the Greek language, enjoys a wide circulation. The publication of the works of Marxist-Leninist classics and other progressive political literature has increased considerably. Progress was made in the organization of intraparty education. Seminars and lectures were organized and the party organizations are provided with the necessary propaganda materials.

All these efforts contributed to the dissemination among the toiling masses of the Marxist-Leninist ideas, the popularization of the party line, the exposure of hostile bourgeois ideology, the struggle against rightwing and leftwing revisionism, the study of the problems of our movement and of the country at large, and the enhancement of the ideological standard of the party's membership, its aktiv, and the KNE.⁵

Despite the positive changes, the party's ideological-political and propaganda work stills suffers from serious shortcomings. Its level is considerably below the requirements of the struggle and of the party's development.

The central ideological and propaganda organ is not always able to clarify the party's line to the proper extent and interpret the various aspects of party practical activities or contribute properly to the creative development of theory and practice.

Mass political work to popularize the party's policy is behind contemporary requirements. Not all possibilities for the dissemination of RIZOSPASTIS are used. The necessary propaganda material for mass distribution is still in short supply. All ways and means of political education and of explaining the party's policy to the broad toiling strata are not used to the necessary extent.

Frequently the ideological and political attacks of our class enemy and the fabrications of opportunists of all hues are not studied with sufficient attention and promptly and properly rebuffed.

The party organs do not deal to the necessary extent with problems of intra-party political education. Many party members and activists are not dedicating the proper efforts for acquiring a Marxist-Leninist education and for constantly deepening and improving their knowledge.

Of late a further aggravation of the ideological struggle has been noted. International imperialism is intensifying its attempts at ideologically undermining the socialist system and the international communist movement.

The reactionary forces of our country are actively participating in all imperialist ideological subversions and are engaged in a propaganda campaign against the communist movement by all possible manners. Their main aspiration is to undermine the prestige of the Greek Communist Party in the broad popular masses.

At the same time, rightwing and leftwing revisionists are energizing their offensive against the basic principles of the Leninist doctrine and against the political line and practical activities of the Greek Communist Party.

All this, like the present circumstances and the problems of the comprehensive struggle we are waging ascribe an exceptional and ever growing importance to the ideological struggle and will require additional efforts for the further development of the party's ideological work and for upgrading its quality and effectiveness.

We should not ignore the major changes which have taken place in recent years in the awareness of the masses, changes in favor of anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly forces, as well as the opportunities created as a result of this for the further energizing of our work among the masses.

The process of radicalization of the masses is developing under the conditions of a deep crisis in the ideology of the ruling class and the increased prestige and influence of progressive ideas, under conditions in which the theory and practice of naked anti-communism, "national thinking," a policy of subordination to Atlantic interests, pursued by the Greek ruling class throughout the entire post-war period, have suffered a major defeat.

However, it would be wrong to assume that such changes in the awareness of the masses automatically lead to finding the proper direction, to drawing positive conclusions, and to formulating a proper position. We must also take into consideration the fact the new social strata and forces joining the mass movement bring into the revolutionary movement bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideas and reformist and opportunistic views of different, rightist or leftist, type. Furthermore, the ruling class is adamantly trying to lead the radicalization of the masses into a direction needed by the bourgeoisie,

keeping it within the "general frameworks" of bourgeois ideology or else preventing the development of the awareness of the masses beyond the ideas of petit bourgeois socialism and anarchism.

The bourgeoisie is trying to "modernize" the ideology of national independence, promoting by all possible ways the so-called "European idea." To this effect the metaphysical theories of the "Greek idea" and "Greco-Christian civilization" are adamantly disseminated. However, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism have always been, and remain, the foundations of the ideology of the ruling class, regardless of its old and new, more "modernized" forms and varieties.

The correct political orientation of the masses is a major party task. Constant efforts must be made to expose the positions of petit bourgeois socialism and ideologically fight nationalism, revisionism, and leftwing extremism, which promote confusion and lead the mass movement to erroneous actions.

We must fight the positions of those who reject the leading role of the working class in the struggle for democracy and socialism, who belittle the significance of the class and anti-monopoly struggle, replacing it either by a spirit of conciliation and class cooperation or by the ideas of some kind of "above class" national-liberation struggle and nationalism, concealed behind the anti-scientific "plan" of pitting the center against the periphery. We must oppose equally firmly the concept of so-called "Greek socialism" in all its varieties, whose supporters absolutize national characteristics and accuse us of allegedly copying foreign "models." All this is being done with a view to distorting the nature of socialism, rejecting its overall laws and experience and achievements in the building of factual socialism, and so on.

In order to create a powerful combat ideological front, based on firm and scientific principles, the exposure of hostile bourgeois propaganda and the struggle against opportunism are not enough. This also requires a well thought out, planned, and coordinated work to disseminate and explain to the masses our ideas and program and the party's suggested solutions of problems facing the people and the country.

Only thus the opening revolutionary prospects could assume the attractive power of an idea which could mobilize the militant movement of the popular masses and prove in practical terms the leading role of the working class in this movement. In this case party propaganda, press, publishing, and all agitation-mass work must play an important role. Naturally, the party organizations themselves must always actively participate in the ideological struggle, popularize our policy among the working people, and convince and call them to action.

Life faces us with the important task of studying and working on the newly appearing problems of the class struggle and of elaborating the further creative development of our theory. This work could be truly fruitful and creative only if based on the Marxist-Leninist principles, confirmed by

reality itself and practically tested. We are faced with the need to broaden and systematize all our efforts in this direction. This is a prerequisite for the more profound and scientific substantiation of our policy and establishing a more complete and clear orientation of party activities.

The party members are faced with a number of problems and, above all, with basic social and economic problems, problems around which is focused the struggle of the broad popular masses and which require further study and elaboration (such as, for example, the foreign dependents of the Greek economy, the crisis, the position of the different classes within Greek society, the state, the problem of the unification of anti-imperialist and democratic forces, problems of culture, and others).

In the field of theoretical activities the efforts of all party scientific organizations must be unified and coordinated. In turn, the party must provide all the necessary conditions to achieve this.

In order to resolve these problems the creative forces and capabilities of the representatives of the Greek progressive intelligentsia must be organized and used rationally. In this connection we must emphasize that we must consider yet once again critically and self-critically the problem of our relations with the progressive intelligentsia and expose the objective difficulties and shortcomings existing in this area. Our task is to formulate a more complete and efficient policy toward the intelligentsia and, in general, concerning problems of the cultural and spiritual development of the people.

Our duty is to prove clearly and convincingly to the progressive intelligentsia that its place is by the side of the working class. One of our party's major tasks is to develop a combat cooperation between the intelligentsia and the struggle of the working class.

It is only by joining forces with the working class and dedicating its knowledge and scientific research to the struggle of the whole people that the intelligentsia could make a substantial contribution to progress. Along with the profound study of problems of cultural and spiritual life, we must always emphasize that cultural life in our country could become radically enriched only with the upsurge and development of our workers' and democratic movement.

One of the important tasks of the party's ideological work is to improve the organization of intraparty education. It is entirely clear that today party construction requires complex and adamant work in the field of cadre ideological training. Let us note that so far the level of the theoretical and the political training of party members remains relatively low. We must continue and intensify even further our efforts in the field of upgrading the ideological-political and theoretical training of party members and leading cadres, relying on existing experience and drawing lessons from the solution of newly arising problems. Our revolutionary theory and policy must become familiar to all party members. The broadening of our party's ranks with

the entry of new young party members makes the task of improving party education even more urgent. In the course of building a mass party the ideological and political unity within its ranks assumes prime significance.

Unless we pay the necessary attention to the efforts to intensify the ideological and political education and theoretical training of the party membership and activists, in the course of the conversion of our party into a mass party the danger may arise of gradually weakening its class nature, combat capability, and effectiveness in its political struggle. Our party must not allow carelessness in matters effecting party education or an attitude toward this work as a secondary task, or else as a task conflicting with the interests of mass organizational work, or any doubt of the usefulness of daily efforts to promote the ideological and political education of the party membership.

On the contrary, as confirmed by the pre-congress discussion, the desire of our party membership to upgrade their theoretical training is becoming ever more adamant. An understanding is being gained of the truth that without the knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory we can not correctly resolve the complex problems of the class struggle in our country and the contemporary world.

We must organize the broad and persistent study of Marxism-Leninism by all party and KNE members through party courses and seminars and self-training. The purpose of political education is to develop the skill and ability of the party members and aktiv creatively to apply its theory and political line in practical work. The strengthening of the ideological and theoretical equipment of party and KNE members will be a powerful protection of the party ranks from the influence of hostile ideology and will enable them to act with greater ideological conviction and confidence in their forces, explain to the masses the party's policy better and more clearly, achieve a better understanding of the problems facing us, struggle more effectively against hostile ideology, and work with revolutionary perspective.

In recent years the theory of so-called "Euro-communism" has been formulated and intensively debated within the international communist and progressive movements. Judging by everything written so far on this matter and, particularly, by the fact that the Greek revisionists present this theory as a specific ideological system, shows that, in the name of seeking a certain "socialist model," "Euro-communism" absolutizes national characteristics, raising them to the level of basic and determining factors, pitting such characteristics against the principal general laws of the socialist revolution, rejecting the experience of existing socialism, and leading to pitting the communist movement against the communist parties of the socialist countries. That is how, here and there, socialism is being divided into various "types."

The Greek Communist Party rejects the theory of "Euro-communism." This does not mean that we confuse "Euro-communism" with the right of any fraternal party to seek a specific way to the revolutionary reorganization of its

country. Conversely, the Greek Communist Party deems as the legal right and duty of each fraternal party to seek the ways and means for socialist reorganization and construction in accordance with the characteristics of its country.

Our party categorically opposes attempts to pit Leninism against Marxism and the theories which reject the international significance of Leninism.

Along with bloody terror, naked violence, and persecution of the members and supporters of the Greek Communist Party, the conservative and fascist forces which seized the power in our country in the post-war period were able to launch against it a monstrous campaign of falsifications and slander. Their main efforts were, and are concentrated on defaming the history of the Greek Communist Party, presenting it as a party allegedly controlled "from the outside," a "party of errors," and as a "anti-national and anti-democratic party." In recent years some renegades or "leftwing" leaders have supported such attempts. Under the pretext of critically analyzing the party's activities, of assessing past experience, and so on, they are competing with our enemies in a joint campaign of lies and slanders against the Greek Communist Party. All this faces us with the urgent task of explaining to the Greek people the truth of our party's historical path and activities.

The truth proves that in the course of its entire tempestuous history the Greek Communist Party has been and remains the firm and tried vanguard of the working class, the defender of the interests of the people and the homeland, loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, opposing all kinds of rightwing and "leftwing" deviations.

No error committed in the struggle against imperialism and the forces of the oligarchy could conceal the historical fact that it is precisely imperialism and the local oligarchy that are the reason for the calamities suffered by the Greek people.

No single error committed in the struggle against powerful enemies could be little or even less deny the significance of the fact that in World War Two and the cold war which followed it, assuming the leadership of the Greek people, the Greek Communist Party courageously opposed the tremendous fascist forces and, subsequently, the two biggest imperialist powers--Great Britain and the United States. No one could also ignore the fact that this struggle waged by our party, regardless of its outcome, is inspiring our people also in their present struggle against the domination of American imperialism and NATO, and against the local oligarchy.

The writing and publication of a short history of the Greek Communist Party, which is deemed necessary, will be nothing but a clear reflection of the tremendous work done by the party for the people and for Greece in the course of its 60 years of activity. Naturally, the writing of such a work would demand major efforts and time.

We are convinced that the implementation of this task will be helped by the publication of various historical studies and monographs covering individual periods or areas of party activities, the continued publication of archives and materials of the Greek Communist Party, and scientific debates and seminars conducted by Marxist historians and other party ideological workers.

The Central Committee Theses for our congress contain a number of other problems of party strategy and tactics such as, for example, that of the motive forces of democracy and the people, the question of the socialist state, and many others, extensively discussed in the pre-congress period by the organizations and within the party press.

In the view of the Central Committee, the present report contains the most important political, organizational, and ideological problems facing our party at the present stage. Allow me to express the profound conviction that the congress, its answers to questions raised on topical problems, and its decisions which will open realistic and optimistic prospects for the revolutionary struggle, will become an important landmark on the heroic path of our great party, a party which celebrates this year, with legitimate pride, the 60th anniversary of its history, a history full of fierce struggle and sacrifices for the sake of the interests of the working class and all working people, the renaissance of Greece, and the happiness of its people.

Long live the Greek Communist Party--the vanguard of the working class and the entire toiling people in the struggle for national independence, democracy, peace, and socialism!

Long live the unity of the international communist and workers' movement on the basis of the immortal doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism!

FOOTNOTES

1. Restorative Party of the Working People of Cyprus.
2. Panhellenic Socialist Movement--a party organized by Andreas Papandreou in 1974.
3. A revisionist dissident group which split from the Greek Communist Party in 1968.
4. The period of the fall of the black colonel's regime in 1974.
5. Organization of the Greek Communist Youth created in 1968 in deep clandestinity.

SERGEI EISENSTEIN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 63-69

[Article by R. Yurenev]

[Text] The Great October Socialist Revolution radically changed the social functions and moral obligations of artistic culture. V. I. Lenin's confidence that elitist art, dedicated to the "sated heroine," would be replaced by a new, more powerful, and more effective art, consciously serving the "millions and tens of millions of working people who are the flower of the country, its strength, and its characteristic," was justified. All real artists understood or felt this. Some were horrified by the "sacrilegious" destruction of the barriers between sacred art and terrible, disturbed reality. Others, protecting obsolete traditions, tried for a while to stand aside. The best -- Gor'kiy, Blok, Bryusov, Kustodiyev, and Mayakovskiy -- accepted the revolution and, surmounting all difficulties, found their place in the ranks of the builders of the new life. Lenin, Lunacharskiy, Krupskaya, and many other Bolsheviks did everything possible to support and help them.

One of Lenin's brilliant insights in the field of mass popular culture had to do with cinematography. This new art form was only 20 years old. It was taking its first hesitant steps. Yet it was here that bad taste, trite topics, decadent expressions, and, sometimes, petty reactionary thoughts, were evidenced to their fullest extent. Lenin saw all this, and as early as 1907, he stated that motion pictures could cause more harm than good. Immediately, however, he added that it would be a different matter if they came into the hands of true workers of socialist culture... Then came the revolution. Lenin warned Lunacharskiy that cinematography was the most important of all the arts to us. He saw its mass and accessible nature, its wealth of means of expression, and its functionality.

But cinematography was in a state of chaos. The entrepreneurs and owners of motion picture companies were fleeing to the south, to the Whites, while the more clever ones were getting out of the country. Actors and directors were in a state of confusion. Everyone understood that melodrama, mystical movie stories, and semidecent farces were wanted by no one. The best of the film workers turned to documentaries, went to the front, where "graphic

journalism," as Lenin called it, was being born. The most perspicacious of the directors and actors filmed the classics: Tolstoy, Gertsen, and Turgenev. This was of cultural and educational significance. The most daring of them made short agitation films on current topics -- the war, the surplus appropriations system, the struggle against epidemics, and proletarian discipline. These still naive and weak agitation films already contained glimpses of a new idea-mindedness, new topics, and attitudes toward the audience. Yet how inconsistent with the events of the first years of the socialist era these timid attempts were! Socialist reality, the revolution, the people demanded an entirely different scale, different feelings and colors!

Then the new artists appeared. The overwhelming majority of them had been trained in the school of the civil war and the Red Army. Dziga Vertov, the poet of the documentary and the founder of moving picture journalism, began as the editor and paster of front line chronicles. It was there that Lev Kuleshov, a reformer of the acting profession and one of the first teachers of cinematography, began his own filming. Vsevelod Pudovkin, escaping from German captivity, was attracted to motion pictures as an actor, director, artist, scenarist, theoretician, and organizer. From the different fronts and by different paths, Yevgeniy Chervyakov, Sergey and Georgiy Vasil'yev, Grigoriy Aleksandrov, Ivan Pyr'yev, Fridrikh Ermler, and others came to the motion picture field. What a great variety of lives, characters, inclinations, and tastes! How differently they began -- some immediately, and with great success, and others gradually, persistently, mastering the complex art of cinematography step by step. However, all these young people, scorched by the war and inspired by the revolution, had one thing in common: they tried sincerely to devote all their strength and capabilities to the people building a new life. All of them understood that the new, revolutionary content would demand new methods, new creative principles, new forms.

It was among these confident and noisy, irreconcilable and ardent, hungry and happy creators of an unmatched, innovative, and phenomenal art form -- the Soviet motion picture -- that Sergei Eisenstein, with justification, took the main, the leading position.

His creative fate is unusual, yet typical. His life was difficult, full of conflict, and sometimes tragic. Yet at the same time, it was beautiful. It was the life of a revolutionary artist.

There was nothing to suggest tempestuous change and a dramatic destiny. The son of a leading engineer and architect of russianized Viga German stock, the heirs of Arkhangel'sk merchants, he received a thorough education. He had governesses, studied foreign languages, and was given any book he wanted. As a boy of eight, he was even taken to Paris, where he first saw a moving picture. But other, more serious things also made an impression upon him. For example workers' demonstrations in the streets of Riga; clashes involving Russians, Germans, and Latvians, in his high school years; the religious fanaticism of an orthodox grandmother; and,

finally, his parents' quarrels, difficult and scandalous scenes, and a divorce.... The mother left for Petrograd, while the boy remained in Riga with his father, or rather, in fact, alone with his books, drawings, and dreams. He earned marks of "5" in everything except drawing, in which he got a "4." And it was precisely in drawing that his inordinate talent was first to emerge. He covered many thick sketchbooks with drawings from life, caricatures, and whole stories in pictures, in the style of modern cartoons....

After graduating from high school, the young man enrolled at the Petrograd Civil Engineering Institute and went to live with his mother. However, his choice of careers was based on the wish expressed and example set by his father. But he was not destined to become an architect and engineer. The revolution changed all of these good plans.

He saw the revolution. He saw the July firing into the demonstrations in Nevskiy Square. He saw enraged members of the bourgeoisie beating a wounded worker. He heard the exchange of fire. He felt the stormy and irreversible events of October 1917. He tried to become involved in them. He took antibourgeois caricatures to the newspapers. He joined the people's militia and protected revolutionary order, weapon in hand. At the beginning of 1918, he left the institute and joined the Red Army as a volunteer.

The student-builder was assigned to the engineers. He built bridges and fortifications to oppose the advancing Yudenich. In his free time, he read, dreamed of the theater, and sketched imaginary shows. Being a designer, he was assigned to do agitation posters, and subsequently was made a scene designer for the Red Army amateur theater. Here he painted, directed, and even performed. He also tried to write revolutionary plays. After he was demobilized, he was sent to Moscow to the Department of Eastern Languages at the General Staff Academy to study Japanese, since he already spoke German, French, and English. He retained an interest in ideograms all through his lifetime. However, he did not continue his studies. He was powerfully attracted by the theater.

The "theatrical October" proclaimed by Meyyerkhol'd was raging in Moscow. The old silent film theaters were experiencing the pressure from all kinds of studios, workshops, and collectives, which appeared and disappeared with incredible speed. Having made the rounds of the theaters, Eistenstein chose the Proletkul't.

This public organization, the purpose of which was to create a new, proletarian culture, and which had made a number of ideological errors, was in the process of reorganizing its work following Lenin's stern and irrefutable criticism. There was no more talk of Proletkul't "autonomy," in terms of the Soviet state. Bogdanov's idealistic concepts were rejected. The defaming of all the old arts and artists whose origins lay in bourgeois society calmed down. Attempts were being made in the Proletkul't workshops

to create literary, graphic, and theatrical works which would praise the revolution, depict the lives of the workers and peasants, and expose capitalism, anti-Sovietism, and the domestic and foreign enemies.

Eisenstein began as a painter. He was working on the show "The Mexican," based on a Jack London story, in which the young character played by Ivan Pyr'yev was fighting professional boxers to earn money for a revolutionary organization. Eisenstein shifted the action to a real boxing ring set in the middle of the spectators' hall. Later, along with Sergey Tret'yakov of the periodical LEF, he, as director, adapted Ostrovskiy's play "The Wise Man Likes Simplicity" as a political revue critical of the Entente, the White Guards, and the White emigres. Ostrovskiy's characters were given different names -- Milyukov, Vrangel', and Poincare -- and were mocked satirically by means of circus tricks, acrobatics, and even an eccentric, short motion picture. The show was a success, but it was clear that the revolution needed its own new plays. At Eisenstein's suggestion, such were written by Sergey Tret'yakov. His play "Do You Hear, Moscow?" dealt with the internationalism of the workers' movement. "Gas Masks" dealt with workers' solidarity and the new attitude toward labor. In an effort to bring his art closer to the workers' audience, Eisenstein staged "Gas Masks" not in a theater, but in a gas plant, in the midst of the gas tanks. The workers welcomed the first show enthusiastically, although subsequent shows hindered the plant's normal operation. From this Eisenstein derived the unexpected conclusion that the very art of the theater had become obsolete and could not be reformed. "It is stupid to improve on the wooden plow. A tractor is needed." He regarded moving pictures as that tractor in art, the offspring of industrialization. Together with a whole group sharing his ideas, he switched to cinematography.

Today it is easy to see the errors and extremes in his searchings. He was to be blamed for his innovation and told that the theater is immortal and still developing. The wise and educated Eisenstein understood this himself. Despite the rejection of the classical heritage by the Proletkul't, as the head of that theater, he staged plays by Shakespeare and Shaw, and taught his actors various subjects -- from the history of aesthetic theory to acrobatics. Throughout his life, he loved and revered the art of the past. However, his conviction that the revolution, the new public, and the new social relations demanded of the artist new content and forms always dominated his thinking. He experimented and searched adamantly, with daring and dedication.

Despite the Proletkul't nihilism, Eisenstein relied in his innovational searches on tremendous and varied philosophical, scientific, and artistic experience. He studied ancient and Eastern philosophies, read the latest philosophers in various languages, and made a profound study of the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. His books were always at hand. He was a great expert on Leonardo da Vinci, El Greco, Daumier, and Serov. He turned to the works of Balzac, Zola, Dickens, and Joyce, not to mention Pushkin and Tolstoy, constantly. He was familiar with the works of Darwin, Helmholtz, Sechenov, and Einstein. He cooperated and was friendly with Mayakovskiy,

Picasso, Rivera, Barbusse, Feuchtwanger, Eluard, Robeson, and Mei Lan-fang, and many cinematographers in other countries. Throughout his life he read, made abstracts, and studied, and always tried to share his knowledge with others. All of his creative discoveries came in the course of the mastery of a tremendous volume of material and the sharing of this knowledge with his numerous students.

Unlike the advocates of traditional aesthetics, which provided an interpretation of art as such, Eisenstein approached it from the viewpoint of the audience and its perceptions. He realized that the viewer could best be influenced by means of a different kind of nature, power, and acuteness -- the so-called means of attraction. He proclaimed the combination or montage of these attractions, imbued with specific political ideas, to be the basic principle of the new play writing, replacing traditional composition, theme, and plot. Eisenstein described this in Mayakovskiy's periodical LEF. A debate began. Accusations were hurled. Today we realize that the montage of attractions does not exclude other theatrical principles. However, the alternating of influences on the audience is basic not only to documentaries, all sorts of surveys, pantomimes, and mass attractions, but must be taken into account in a number of feature films and performances as well.

Eisenstein used such attractions in directing his first full-length feature film, "The Strike." Reviewing this motion picture, PRAVDA described it as "the first revolutionary work on our screens." This was true.

Motion pictures were revived with the New Economic Policy. However, in a hurry to fill the screen, film makers occasionally turned to the hackneyed formulae of the bourgeoisie cinema. Furthermore, a flow of foreign motion pictures, primarily American, flooded the screen. Eisenstein realized that both bourgeois influence and foreign competition must be resisted. What was the strength of the American films? Sharp plots and outstanding film stars who acted well. Thus the attraction of fabricated situations had to be countered by the real phenomena of revolutionary reality, while the star would be the collective hero -- the fighting workers.

Eisenstein planned a series of films on the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and its methods. Some films in this series dealt with the clandestine press, agitation, secret meetings, the struggle in jails and in exile, strikes, and mass revolutionary actions. The main character was the Russian proletariat, the working revolutionary mass. It was decided to begin with a film on strikes, based on the real facts of 1905, 1907, and 1912. However, all of them were combined in a single image, showing the methods used in striking.

Eisenstein was not completely successful. The film includes unnecessarily complex and experimental portions and weak scenes. Its main feature, however -- the mass indignation of the workers, the days on strike, the secret meetings, demonstrations and the savage dispersal of them -- is presented with impressive power and truthfulness on a large scale. Eisenstein discovered that with the combination of various images, a film

achieves an artistic effect close to literary metaphor, and that the means of expression -- broad panning, close shots, lighting, and frame sequence -- created a kind of special language in which one could discuss the most important political, historical, and contemporary topics.

The making of a film on the 1905 revolution, in connection with the 20th anniversary of that event, was entrusted to Eisenstein and his group, which included cameraman E. Tisse, assistants G. Aleksandrov, A. Antonov, M. Shtraukh, and others, by the Soviet government.

Together with the young communist writer N. Agadzhanova-Shutko, Eisenstein wrote a scenario which covered all the basic events of the first Russian revolution: 9 January and the strikes in Baku and Ivanovo-Voznesensk, the disturbances in the navy, and the December battles in Moscow... The anniversary year, 1925, was in progress and the film should perhaps have been ready for the December ceremonies. But history kept disclosing to the artist ever newer facts, each more interesting than the last. Visiting Odessa to film a minor episode for the picture, Eisenstein was so impressed by tales of the events aboard the battleship Knyaz' Potemkin-Tavricheskiy in the port of Odessa that he decided to make an entire movie about them. Lenin's assessment of the events in Odessa and the abundant testimony supplied by the participants bespoke the great significance, revolutionary pathos, and typical nature of these events, and the possibility of presenting a composite picture of the revolution.

A whole body of literature has been created about the great film "The Battleship Potemkin," the history of its filming, the enthusiasm of all participants, including the characters in the crowd scenes, and the creative discoveries of the director, cameraman, and his excellent assistants. The film was finished on schedule and was shown at a special ceremony in the Bolshoi Theater.

The scenes of the sailors' outrage at the wormy borscht, the attempts to deal with the "rebels" and their battles with the officers, the scenes at Vakulinchuk's grave and at the port, the hoisting of the Red flag over the battleship, the procession of townspeople's skiffs to the ship in the throes of mutiny, and the terrible, starkly tragic scene of the firing upon the civilian population on the Odessa Steps, the Potemkin's volley at the staff of the punitive forces, and, finally, the vast, striking scene in which the ship proceeds through the rest of the fleet, with the sailors refusing to open fire against it, as well as many other parts of the film, are still studied throughout the world as examples of the cinematographic art.

In both "Battleship" and "Strike," historical accuracy and veracity are combined with impressive artistic imagery. It would be difficult to describe the huge wave with which the film begins, the incarnation of Lenin's expression "the wave of the revolution." There are details in the battle with the officers: the pince-nez dangling from a ship's mast, a cross stuck on the ship's deck, and the billowing of the tarpaulin

covering those sentenced to be shot; the fog on the troubled night after the uprising; the tumultuous crowds running toward the jetty; and the details of revenge: soldiers marching down the steps, a child who has been shot, a baby carriage accelerating in its mortal plunge down the steps, the face of a teacher split open by a whip. And finally, the volley and the shattering of the marble lion! Theoreticians argue about the significance of this image, while every audience gasps on seeing it.... In conclusion, the metaphor with which the film ends: the moving pistons and shafts of the battleship's engines, like the beating of a heart, the heart of the revolution. Its high prow advancing toward the audience, the unconquered vessel proceeds toward immortality!

"The Battleship Potemkin" made the rounds of the world's screens to the fierce accompaniment of the shouts of the enemies of the revolution and the obstacles of bourgeois censorship, being welcomed enthusiastically by progressive and all art-loving people. It is still making those rounds. Countless millions of people have seen it. One can no longer keep track of the awards it has won. Prizes, posters, leaflets, congresses, books, and surveys have acknowledged it as the greatest motion picture of all time. No single film has ever enjoyed such total and uninterrupted success.

Meanwhile, Eisenstein was already hurrying to produce a new work. He began filming "General Line," the first feature film on collectivization. He was intrigued by the solution of the revolutionary conflicts of our time. But the film on the rural sector had to be postponed. The governmental commission in charge of the celebrations of the tenth anniversary of the Great October Revolution assigned the production of the main anniversary film to Eisenstein.

Interrupting the filming of "General Line," Eisenstein and Aleksandrov plunged into the history of the revolution. Various scenarios were used during the filming of the picture. These artists were assisted in their tremendous organizational task by Podvoyskiy. All of Leningrad watched the filming at the Winter Palace, in Nevskiy Square, and on the seafront... Essays, articles, poems... In the May demonstration by the workers, the flags and slogans of 1917 were used in order to film it as the revolutionary action undertaken against the provisional government. Hundreds of the people who had taken part in the attack upon the reactionary fortress in 1917 participated in the filming of the storming of the Winter Palace.

The deadline was fast approaching. Eisenstein was exhausted by the abundance and overwhelming significance of the material available. He even lost his eyesight for a few days due to stress. But the first version of the film was shown at the 7 November ceremony in the Bolshoi Theater.

Lenin's speech from the armored car, the firing in July, the storming of the Winter Palace, the proclamation of the Soviet system, and other key events in the revolutionary year 1917 were depicted in the film with documentary veracity and graphically impressive presentation. For the first time, Eisenstein decided to use an actor to portray Vladimir Il'ich.

Although not all of the scenes were equally successful, the parts showing Lenin as the tribune and leader of the people's masses were distinguished by truthfulness, dynamism, and monumental presentation.

In working on "October," Eisenstein took into account the cognitive potential offered by moving pictures and the graphic characteristics of their language, as well as the means which could be used to express scientific and political concepts. He tried to test his aesthetic findings, described as the theory of intellectual cinema, through creative practical work. Through his montage of religious images -- from the great bronze Sabaoth to the wooden idol -- he presented the concept of divinity. Putting together frames showing the life of Kerenskiy, little statuettes of Napoleon, and the gold-plated peacocks from the collection in the Hermitage, he revealed the dictatorial manners of an ill-starred ruler. He combined images of Eser and Menshevik speakers with pictures of balalaikas, hinting clearly at the barren sound of their talks. Not all his experiments were successful. However, the merciless satirical meaning of most of these intellectual metaphors was clear to all, and was always effective. The film was discussed by number of people: old Bolsheviks, workers, and agitators, not to mention critics and cinematographers. N. K. Krupskaya published a profound study of the film in PRAVDA, describing it as "a bit... of the art of the future."

Returning to the topic of collectivization, Eisenstein, together with Aleksandrov and cameraman Tisse, compared the old Russian countryside, with its poverty, inequality, and superstitions with the new socialist countryside, in a sharp contrast. The picture was entitled "Old and New." As always, practical creative work was given a theoretical interpretation. Aspiring to a maximal mental and ideological meaning for each frame and scene, Eisenstein formulated the concept of "overtone montage," the harmonious combination of film frames with the most delicate nuances of motion picture expression.

Cinematography was entering a new era. Sound came to the film world. Many of the greatest Western artists, even innovators like Charles Chaplin and Rene Clair, feared the new expressive potential. Moving pictures might have lost their specific nature and become "photographed theater." Along with V. Pudovkin and G. Aleksandrov, Eisenstein wrote a manifesto definitely welcoming sound pictures in their very first experimental stage. The Soviet masters saw in sound and music, organically blended with picture images, a new possibility for expressing meanings and ideas. The Soviet government decided to send Eisenstein, Aleksandrov, and Tisse to Western Europe and the United States to study the technology of motion pictures with sound.

However, Eisenstein and his friends met their foreign colleagues not as humble students, but as the proud representatives of the new socialist culture. The fame of "Potemkin," "October," and "Old and New" thundered the world over. Eisenstein read papers on Soviet art, Soviet films, and the Soviet way of life in Zurich, Berlin, Hamburg, Brussels, London,

Cambridge, Paris, Antwerp, and other European cities. Motion pictures accompanied his speeches. But the police interfered with the activities of the "Red agitator." He was refused visas. The public was indignant. The greatest Western writers, including George Bernard Shaw, Luigi Pirandello, and James Joyce expressed their desire to work with Eisenstein ... However, no one could provide the necessary financing.

Then financing was offered by Paramount, the largest American film company. The Russian "trio" crossed the ocean. In America too, there were lectures, reports, hullabaloo in the press, and reactionary curses and threats. In Hollywood, Eisenstein wrote the outstanding scenario for "Sutter's Gold," based on a Blaise Sandrar novel, and also one for "An American Tragedy," based on Theodore Dreiser's novel. Both writers were enthusiastic about Eisenstein's interpretation. However, the Paramount management was afraid of the revolutionary and antibourgeois pathos of the scenarios. These merchants did not care for the creative discoveries of the Soviet artist, who was the first to develop the method of the "inner monologue" in his scenarios, i.e., the penetration of the minds, the thinking processes, of the characters. Nor were Eisenstein's other ideas approved. The contract was cancelled...

Meanwhile, on the advice of Diego Rivera, Siqueiros, and other Mexicans, the American socialist writer Upton Sinclair offered Eisenstein a modest sum to film a short ethnographic documentary on Mexico. Eisenstein and his friends agreed. And so the three Soviet masters, with the selfless aid of a few Mexican students and journalists, shot more than 70,000 meters of film, i.e., enough material for a gigantic motion picture which would cover Mexico's thousand years of history. Spending money only on food, travel, and film, and earning not a penny, they established the basis for a motion picture which marked the beginning of the Mexican national film industry. But Sinclair ran out of money, and all sorts of promoters of intrigue tried to cause quarrels between him and Eisenstein. Receiving exciting news in letters from Moscow, Eisenstein left America without completing the film. Paramount bought the brilliant material from Sinclair and, using amateurs, made from it several motion pictures which failed to reflect the intent of the Soviet artists.

Until the end of his days, Eisenstein grieved over the loss of his most beloved offspring. Not until now was it possible for the USSR Gosfil'mo-fond to collect all of the motion pictures based on Eisenstein's Mexican material, including all the unused bits. Under the guidance of G. Aleksandrov, the Mosfil'm moving picture studio is attempting to restore his tremendous concept. Thus the world may yet see Eisenstein's film...

In his homeland, this enthusiastic worker plunged into his labors. Again there were lectures and reports, but they no longer concerned what we might learn from practical experience in foreign cinematography. Using the whole of his erudition and experience, Eisenstein tried to train young directors at the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography. He wrote newspaper articles and scenarios. But failure pursued him. He did not complete his

works on the historic epic of Moscow or the comedy about turncoats. The filming of "Bezhin Meadow," dealing with the class struggle in the countryside and the exploits of Pioneer Pavlik Morozov also went unfinished. However, neither failure nor a severe case of smallpox could stop Eisenstein. He embarked upon the exceptionally complex task of recreating the heroic pages of ancient history on the screen in a film about Aleksandr Nevskiy and the 13th Century.

In cooperation with writer P. Pavlenko and his regular cameraman, E. Tisse, the composer Prokofiev, and the splendid actors N. Cherkasov, N. Okhlopkov, A. Abrikosov, D. Orlov, and others, he created a masterpiece of the historical genre. The picture was completed in record time. The slaughter on the ice was filmed in summer. However, it was not such miracles which went down in the history of motion pictures. The real miracle was the fact that the events of the 13th Century were made to seem contemporary, and the historical frescoes were accepted as agitation posters. "Patriotism is my topic!" Eisenstein proclaimed, and the cur-knights who had attacked Russia, despite the full observance of historical accuracy, were seen by the audience as fascists threatening the Soviet state. Their attack upon the "pigs" resembled breaches made by tanks. The words "Anyone who comes to us sword in hand will die by the sword!" were heard in the film, and the commander's statement echoed in the hearts of the Soviet people. When the Great Patriotic War broke out, the film "Aleksandr Nevskiy," along with "Chapayev," "We from Kronshtadt," and the films on Lenin were shown at the front lines on the eve of the harshest battles.

As always, Eisenstein, interpreting his accomplishments theoretically, wrote several works on sound "vertical montage," and on the synthesis of visual and auditory means of expression. He tested his search for synthesis on the stage, with a production of Wagner's "Die Walkure" at the Bolshoi Theater in the USSR. The opera had the sound of a hymn to man, of human feeling triumphing over the gods.

Eisenstein's last film was the two-part film tragedy "Ivan the Terrible." It was made during the war, when the Mosfil'm had been evacuated to Alma-Ata. This canvas, vast in scale, with extremely complex designs and mass battle scenes (such, for example, as the taking of Kazan') and a number of first-rate actors, was filmed under the most difficult conditions. But the production of this tremendous film was a prestige affair for the Soviet cinema industry.

N. Cherkasov, A. Buchma, M. Nazvanov, M. Zharov, P. Kadochnikov, S. Birman, M. Kuznetsov, V. Balashov, L. Tselikovskaya, V. Pudovkin, and many other actors were able to create complex psychological portraits of historical leaders. Cameramen E. Tisse and A. Moskvina gave the audience frames of unforgettable expressiveness and beauty. The music by S. Prokofiev -- one of the finest creations of the great composer -- gave the film unparalleled harmonic unity.

One of the scenes in the second part -- Ivan the Terrible's banquet -- was filmed in color. Red, black and gold symbolized blood, death, and autocracy.

Eisenstein died while he was working on the development of color, at the age of only 50. His sick heart was unequal to withstanding such an intensive burden...

...How many thoughts, how many unfinished works were left in his book-crowded office! There were plans for a six-volume study of Soviet films, the study entitled "Pathos," a book on directing, and other works on montage, color films, and three-dimensional moving pictures. Sketches for new scenarios about Moscow and Pushkin, and stacks of drawings. Lecture summaries, and memoirs of striking frankness and irony. Diaries, not of the events of daily life, but containing drafts of thoughts on art, excerpts from books, and daring hypotheses.

Eisenstein left a vast and useful legacy. All of his films are making the rounds on our screens and television sets, as well as those of Japan, France, New Zealand, Equatorial Africa, Nicaragua, Peru. Everywhere, there are floods of reviews, discussions, discoveries. These films are not only examples of mastery for cinematographers on various continents but also constitute a school for active and effective art for all progressive artists. And even more important, millions of people learn from these films, come to understand the revolution, to fight for it, to love the homeland, and to defend it.

Eisenstein's works have been published in six volumes. Many articles have been translated into English, French, German, Spanish, Japanese, Arabic, and other languages. However, this does not by any means cover the whole of his literary legacy. New articles and thoughts on Eisenstein appear regularly in our periodicals. They are immediately translated and reprinted in various countries, since they are topical, fresh, and contemporary.

How could they fail to be when the great master looked into the future with penetration, marching in the vanguard of time and art? "One must not fear the advent of this new era in art," he wrote. "One must prepare a place in the mind for the coming of unparalleled new topics which, multiplied by the potential of the new technology, will require an unmatched new aesthetics if they are skillfully to be embodied in the striking creations of the future. Blazing a path toward them is a great and sacred task the implementation of which is the duty of everyone who makes so bold as to regard himself as an artist" ("Soch." [Works] Vol III, p 483). He foresaw the tremendous creative potential of television and stereoscopy and the development of the hologram. Only half jokingly, he dreamed of an art perceived by the senses of smell and touch...

Eisenstein's legacy includes not only motion pictures, stage works, and literary creations. He was an excellent designer. His drawings -- sketches for films, Mexican studies, fantasies on literary topics, and caricatures --

have been exhibited in dozens of the world's largest cities and published in several albums. However, many drawings still await publication.

Finally, books and articles about Eisenstein have been published in many countries. They would fill a wide shelf. And yet how distant they are from academic tranquility!

A struggle is being waged over Eisenstein. This sector in the ideological struggle between Soviet artistic culture and its ideological opponents is a heated and important one. The great cinematographer has been attacked from the right. The British Paul (Seydor), for example, does not conceal his hostility toward the revolution and socialism. Briefly acknowledging Eisenstein's individual brilliance, he hastens to defame his revolutionary art. There are attacks from the left as well. Maoists such as J.-L. Godart, who until recently revered the name of Eisenstein, are now charging that he was not extreme enough and that he had a ... bourgeois orientation! Many of them try to overlook the revolutionary content of Eisenstein's pictures, rummaging formalistically among his methods and becoming enraged because they seem strange when deprived of content! To an even greater extent, this is true of those who try to pit Eisenstein against socialist realism, Soviet culture, and our society. Everything is to be found in their writings -- that he was a martyr, a mystic, a religious fanatic, that he fled from reality... All of this is achieved by forging facts, fabrication, vulgar Freudianism, and distortion of the meaning of his films. This nonsense was started with a book written by a certain Mary Seaton, who on meeting Eisenstein in America and Europe was drawn to his personality and work, but following his death, decided to amaze the world with intrigues about him and his psychoanalytical idiosyncrasies... Eisenstein loved to laugh. In his time, he fiercely mocked Goebbels, who had urged the fascist amateurs to create "their own" "Potemkin." There were also American racists and European snobs... The whole of Eisenstein's work and the ineradicable memory of his personality were a blow against the reactionaries, a hymn to the revolution.

However, more serious works on the great master are also being published. These include the works of the Frenchmen Leon Moussinac, Georges Sadoul, Jean Mitry, and Marcel Martin, the Englishman Ivor Montague, the American J. (Leydy), the Japanese Kadzuo Yamada, the Italians Umberto Barbaro and Guido Aristarco, the Poles Jerzy Teplica and Zbigniew Piperi, the Bulgarian Nedelcho Milev, and many, many others. We could argue some points with these authors, and we occasionally see instances of insufficient information. However, one thing is beyond question: anyone who wants to consider Eisenstein seriously must think of Russian culture, the October Revolution, and socialist realism.

Eisenstein did not conceive of himself as outside a socialist society. He responded to all contemporary events, wrote about industrialization and collectivization, the cultural revolution and the socialist outlook, the inhumanity of capitalism, the fascist insanity, the people's exploits in

the Great Patriotic War, the joy of restoration, the unparalleled new construction, and the penetration of outer space. Eisenstein did not see himself without the revolution. He wrote repeatedly that it was the revolution precisely which brought him to the field of art, shaping his work and life. His eternal aspiration to explore the unknown, the new, and his habit of pursuing virgin paths and looking into the future were born of and determined by the revolution.

Eisenstein's work and the very personality of this great artist are the pride of the Soviet people, an inseparable part of socialist culture, and the possessions of all mankind. His amazing talent, inexhaustible energy, vast erudition, and life full of daring and effort were dedicated to the new society and the new art.

5003

CSO: 1802

DEMOCRACY AND CONSTITUTION OF TWO WORLDS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 89-100

[Article by Yu. Agezhin and E. Kuz'min]

[Text] A profound inner link connects two of the greatest events in the life of the Soviet people -- the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the adoption of the new USSR constitution. Significantly, the two events coincided in time with the 60th anniversary of the publication of V. I. Lenin's "State and Revolution" -- that outstanding work of creative Marxism which laid the foundations for the theory of the socialist state. The unbroken line of continuity leading to the fundamental law of 1977 starts with the unsurpassably profound and comprehensive analysis by Lenin of the ties between statehood and the class nature of a society, and his discovery of the nature and tasks of the socialist state and the socialist revolution and passes through the earlier Soviet constitutions, which were saturated with Lenin's thoughts.

As we know, Lenin worked on the book in the period immediately preceding the Great October Revolution. In the concluding remarks in the first edition, explaining the reasons which forced the author to abandon his manuscripts, Vladimir Il'ich noted that "it is more agreeable and useful to acquire 'revolutionary experience' than to write about it" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 33, p 120). Today our society has reached a level of maturity at which the immortal Leninist ideas are most completely embodied in reality. Codifying the developed socialist system -- the highest achievement of civilization as of the present -- in legislative fashion in its new constitution, our country is turning yet another page in universal history and, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the scientifically substantiated policy of the CPSU, is formulating new kinds of social life and work, asserting the ideals of social justice, democracy, humanism, and peace.

The product and manifestation of antagonistic class contradictions, the state developed when these contradictions could not be objectively reconciled. The exploiting society, as a class political institution, had and still has in its hands the tools of power, using which the ruling class subordinates the toiling masses. Two centuries ago, during its struggle

against feudalism, the bourgeoisie raised the banner of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" In reality, however, it always defended the entrepreneurs' freedom to exploit hired labor, while "equality" and "fraternity" were seen as merely a backdrop for that freedom. Verbally identifying itself with the entire nation, and seizing power, it was precisely the broad popular masses which the bourgeoisie made the victims of cruel oppression, while trying to "remove" the working people from power and politics for good.

It was only in the course of the socialist revolution that the gigantic majority of the population was given an opportunity, for the first time, to make use of the state system in its own interests. Subsequently, with the elimination of the exploiting classes, socialist democracy began to be implemented without exceptions. The conditions are being created for the growth of the state of proletarian dictatorship into a socialist state of the whole people, and this develops as an ever more systematic process. The example of socialist democracy demonstrates with particular clarity what Lenin had in mind when, in exposing the false bourgeois concept of socialism as something frozen and fixed forever, he wrote: "...In fact, it is only with socialism that the rapid, real, and truly mass movement forward in all fields of social and individual life will begin, with the participation of the majority of the population, and subsequently, the entire population" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, pp 99-100).

I

The way was paved for the new Soviet constitution by the whole course of social development, and the basic changes in the economy and social structure of the society, in its spiritual sphere, and in the international position of the USSR, which determine and constitute the very essence of the present aspect of the Soviet state. That which is now embodied in the brief articles of the fundamental law, in its clearly evident major outlines of developed socialism, was created through the selfless effort of millions of people under the leadership of the communist party. In the course of heroic and intensive daily construction, to use Lenin's words, the "actual, real" constitution was being created. Above all, the text of the fundamental law reflected the visible features of what was new, comprehensively manifested in all realms of social life. That is the reason Lenin's characterization of the first Soviet constitution, which recorded "that which already exists in practice," is fully applicable to it ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 499).

Continuing and developing the traditions of all Soviet constitutions, our country's new fundamental law systematically, extensively, and comprehensively implements the concept of democracy as rule by the entire people. The constitution codifies the clear and effective mechanism for the exercise of popular rule, revealing the soviets of people's deputies, which are the political basis of the USSR, as its true agent. The constitution emphasizes the leading and guiding role of the communist party, and formulates the tasks and functions of social organizations and labor collectives in the solution of political, economic, and sociocultural problems.

The constitution is a real manifesto of socialist democracy and a great charter of the rights of the man of the new world, the man of a communist civilization. It is precisely in the direction of systematic democratization that the further development of the principles of participation by the working people in management and people's control has been incorporated in the fundamental law, and extensive provisions on the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, along with their duties to the state and the people, have been included. Along the same lines, major stipulations on the strengthening of socialist law and order and the legal foundations of state and public life have been formulated. The solution of problems in connection with the national-governmental system ensures the democratic coordination of the common interests of our multinational union and of its constituent republics, and the all-round blossoming and continued rapprochement among all the nations and nationalities in the Soviet state.

The Marxist concept of democracy is based on the fact that democratic principles are extended to all realms of social life, including production relations, guaranteeing to the working people the opportunity to influence production management actively. This is one of the main watersheds between real socialist and formal bourgeois democracy.

Occasionally, we find in the views of bourgeois ideologues on the political system of the socialist society, including the subject of the new USSR constitution, that Western "political" democracy is pitted against Eastern "economic" democracy, which allegedly violates the "age-old" principles of "pure" democracy and entails a threat to civil rights and freedoms. What can be said on this subject? Marxism has always taken as its basis the fact that the closest possible relationship exists between economics and democracy. "Any democracy and, in general, any political superstructure (inevitable until the elimination of classes and the establishment of a classless society have been achieved)," Lenin emphasized, "serves the production process, in the final analysis, and is determined by the production relations in that society, when all is said and done" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 276). Ensuring the triumph of the new system, the Great October Revolution gave the working people real economic, social, and national liberation. A socialist economy could neither appear nor develop if the working people were excluded from political power. The most effective utilization of economic laws and the solution of the ripe problems in the development of the material life of the society, in turn, create the conditions for the blossoming of socialist democracy.

Under socialism, the drafting and adoption of plans for economic and social development, representing an alloy of a single centralized principle and broad local initiative, are vivid indicators of the close interconnection between the economy and democracy. This unity was manifested with new vigor in the course of the formulation and adoption, at the Eighth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, of the 1978 State Plan for Economic and Social Development. The nationwide discussion of the draft constitution, in the course of which the working people submitted numerous suggestions related

to the improvement of the economy and the organization of production and management, and assumed new labor obligations, successfully fulfilling them, became yet another powerful incentive for the country's national economic upsurge.

Therefore, the socialist state system, the legal system, and democracy as a whole, exert a positive influence on the economy, "urging its reorganization forward," as Lenin wrote in his work "State and Revolution," in analyzing the problem of the development of a democracy "to the end," as one of the tasks of the social revolution (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 79). At the same time, the total domination of the social ownership of productive capital and the high level of the development of production forces constitute a reliable material base for the advancement of democracy, the systematic broadening of the rights of citizens, and the strengthening of their respective guarantees. An objective criterion such as the steady enhancement of the population's cultural standard and education is of key importance to the systematic development of democracy. The historical creativity, activity, and initiative of the mass reveal the major advantages and inexhaustible constructive potential of developed socialism and earmark new possibilities for its further establishment as the highest form of organization for the human community at present.

Could the capitalist system actually match such life-giving sources of socialist strength? "Traditionally," the bourgeois ideologues have always considered free enterprise, competition, and trade to be the main advantages of capitalism. It is true that in the history of the establishment and development of the capitalist socioeconomic system, these principles played a most important role in the growth of the production forces. First of all, however, this applies primarily to the relatively early stage of capitalism, when competition dominated the economy. Secondly, the implementation of these principles had already at that time very clearly revealed the inhuman and man-hating nature of this exploitive system, which, as Marx said, "oozed blood and dirt from all its pores, from head to toe."

Today the capitalist system is rotting on its own foundations. The destruction of the "healthy nature" of capitalism, which began as it entered its state-monopoly stage, has reached its peak, proving the existence of an overall crisis within the capitalist system as a whole. At the solemn meeting held in connection with the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stressed, in clearly and convincingly describing the main trends in this crisis in the economic, political, and spiritual realms, that "All this indicates that the objective economic and sociopolitical prerequisites for the transition to socialism have reached a high level of maturity. The aspiration of the masses for radical change is growing in the capitalist countries." The degradation of the political system under capitalism, which is becoming ever more apparent, is forcing the bourgeois ideologues to seek means of "renovating" it, on the one hand, and to react sharply to the historical alternative which exists in fact -- socialist democracy -- on the other hand.

The methods by means of which the imperialist propagandists have tried to block the increasing influence of socialism on the minds of the people in the course of the discussions of the draft USSR constitution are quite noteworthy in this connection.

Some bourgeois press organs reported the content of the document more or less objectively. Meanwhile, as has occurred on countless other occasions in the course of the existence of the Soviet state, specialists in "psychological warfare" used every available means to distort the content of our new constitution and to belittle its significance. However, neither the "conspiracy of silence" which was tried initially nor the reports that the draft was formulated "for propaganda purposes," containing "nothing new," nor even the old fabrications about "party dictatorship" and "violations of human rights" in the USSR could conceal from the toiling masses the world over the truth about the Soviet society and its new and consistently democratic fundamental law.

The international significance of the constitution of the USSR is manifested above all in the practical implementation of Lenin's immortal ideas on the socialist society. Codifying the historical gains of the people, it has a tremendous impact both on the revolutionary process the world over, and on the constitutional and other legislation in foreign countries, as well as on the development of contemporary international relations and the content of treaties, agreements, and other documents. The toiling people in the fraternal countries see the USSR constitution as containing a clear theoretical and practical guideline for their path toward a developed socialist society. All the progressive forces abroad -- in the capitalist and the young developing states -- regard the fundamental law of the Soviet state as convincing proof of the great vital force of world socialism, which is successfully resolving the specific problems in the building of communism.

II

The constitutions of the capitalist countries contain many statements about the "power of the people" and "freedom and democracy for all." "We, the people of the United States," stipulates the preamble to the constitution of the United States, "... do ordain and establish this constitution..." "All governmental power derives from the people," proclaims the constitution of the FRG. Similar statements can be found in the constitutions of other Western countries. The bourgeoisie and its ideologues are trying hard to depict the power system under capitalism as a model of "pure" democracy, a kind of absolute value with a self-sufficing significance. However, this is a cover for a clear class trend -- in fact, modern bourgeois democracy is a form of power ensuring the total domination of monopoly capital.

The most important prerequisites and main condition for the realistic nature of the provisions of the Soviet constitution to the effect that all of the power belongs to the people are the social ownership of productive capital and the consequent sociopolitical and ideological unity linking

the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, the people's intelligentsia, and the working people of all nationalities in the country, rallied around the CPSU. World history and all contemporary political practice demonstrate irrefutably that it is possible to speak of the factual "rule of the people for the people" when the people are an organic comity, when the interests of all social and national groups in the population coincide on basic issues, and are manifested, respectively, in the policy pursued. Under capitalist conditions, in a society torn by class contradictions, the constitutional declarations concerning the "single will of the people" never become more than verbal assertions. Despite the desire to give them a supraclass form, objectively, these constitutions embody the will of a class in a dominant position in the economy and, by virtue of that fact, exerting a decisive influence on politics and ideology.

The ailments of bourgeois democracy, which are rooted in the very foundations of the capitalist system, are so serious and have affected the capitalist world so deeply that even many Western scientists and publicists make sometimes rather sharply critical remarks and express ever graver doubts about the ability of the economic and political systems in their countries to survive in the face of these growing difficulties. The French periodical LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE published an article under the elequent title "Capitalism Against Democracy." On the basis of studies conducted by a group of sociologists, historians, economists, and jurists, convincing proof of the severe crisis in which bourgeois democracy finds itself is offered. The article cites a number of examples showing the largely false nature of bourgeois elections, giving proof of voters' political apathy, and revealing the intensification of social inequality. It also contains a very accurate description of bourgeois democracy as a "political screen... for the exploitation of labor." The fact that many human rights which the bourgeois propagandists are so fond of vaunting "are immediately questioned the moment the right to profits seems to be less assured" is acknowledged.

Naturally, under present conditions, the monopolistic oligarchy cannot totally ignore the increasing organization and power of the working class or the political activity of the working people as a whole, and so it grants occasional concessions. Such gains for the working people are of great value in their struggle, for on the one hand, they erect a certain obstacle against the antidemocratic and authoritarian manifestations of capitalist rule and, on the other, they represent the starting position, the bridge-head, from which the working class and the people's masses mount their offensive in the struggle for democratization, social liberation, and progress. The more important, the stronger, this position becomes, the greater the potential offered to the working people for the defense of their class interests and objectives.

In recent years, under pressure from the masses, the voting age has been lowered to 18, and some other requirements also have been eliminated or reduced. However, "the power of the haves" is maneuvering and adapting to the characteristics of the struggle being waged in the political sector, including electoral struggle, under contemporary conditions. The mechanism

for the removal of the working people from participation in the management of society, with the help of the institutions established by the bourgeois constitutions, is on the whole simple. Initially, it is proclaimed that universal suffrage and the parliament are the supreme embodiment of the sovereignty of the people. Then every possible means is used to limit the "universality" of the right to vote and the role of the parliament is reduced to a minimum. In order to promote their nominees, the monopolies use a wide range of means, from the gerrymandering of electoral districts with a view to dividing the population and ensuring the freedom of the ruling groups to maneuver to the active use of vast amounts of money and direct pressure on the voters, often accompanied by illegal machinations. In such an atmosphere, many voters abstain, showing their clear unwillingness to participate in the "play of political forces." Abstention as a phenomenon is particularly characteristic of the United States, where only 53.3% of the voters took part in the 1976 presidential elections, for example.

The fact that the representatives of the rich classes and strata invariably become parliamentarians is a natural result of bourgeois elections. This situation exists in many other "representative" Western institutions as well. Obviously, the final word lies with the ruling state-monopoly elite, which uses every possible means to make the parliamentary system the obedient executor of its will.

In our day, naturally, the parliament is a complex and contradictory phenomenon. On the one hand, the history of bourgeois society shows that to date, the parliamentary system has greatly contributed to the alienation of the working people from the exercise of power, only giving them the opportunity to decide, once every few years, who will "represent and suppress" the people in the organs of power. Today as well, the representative institutions in bourgeois society serve the interests of the ruling class, enabling it to express its will through "national" and mandatory laws, while at the same time moderating the conflicts among the various sectors of the bourgeoisie itself, to a certain extent. On the other hand, we must take into full account the new aspects of the developing situations, wherein representatives of left-wing forces who support measures the implementation of which might create the conditions favoring truly progressive changes in the future are beginning to play an ever more important role in the parliaments of the various countries. The past decade has been characterized by an increased struggle on the part of the forces of democracy and progress to use parliamentary institutions in the interests of the working people and to implement factual and effective measures with a view to the satisfaction of the basic needs and interests.

It is not surprising that under such circumstances, monopoly capital and the military industrial complex are no longer satisfied to organize elections the mechanism of which occasionally suffers a major breakdown. To an ever greater extent, they are trying to shift the center of gravity of the exercise of power to governmental institutions which can be directly controlled far more simply. Increased bureaucratic centralization and the

concentration of power levers in the hands of an ever smaller circle of individuals directly representing the monopoly faction of the bourgeoisie are manifestations of reactionary trends in the development of the contemporary imperialist state. In order to maintain its rule, the monopoly bourgeoisie also needs more powerful means of direct class coercion (army, police) and an ever more refined and vastly more expensive ideological apparatus.

The systematic strengthening of the role of the representative organs of power and intensified control of the work of the executive apparatus in the socialist countries are in sharp contrast to the trend toward emasculation of the democratic institutions in the capitalist world. Bringing the people into the arena of active historical effort, the October Revolution provided the creativity of the people with unparalleled scope. With the actual establishment of socialism, serious changes occur in the minds and outlook of the working people. The need to participate in the great achievements, the feeling of owning the country, and high civic-mindedness have become inseparable features of the aspect and behavior of the Soviet individual. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted, developed socialism today has "yet another powerful force for accelerating economic growth: the creative activity, initiative, and labor enthusiasm of millions of people, rising up from below,* or more accurately, from the very depths of society."

This powerful motive force is particularly extensively and comprehensively revealed in the new Soviet constitution. The forms of participation by the working people in state and public affairs codified in it and their influence on all processes occurring within society are unequalled anywhere in worldwide political practice in variety and wealth. This also is the concern of the organs of power -- the soviets -- of which more than 2 million people's deputies with an aktiv 30 million strong are members, the comprehensive activities of the trade union, youth, women's, and other social organizations of the working people, as well as the systematic initiative of the labor collectives, the primary nuclei of our entire economic and political organism. One of the actual and very effective manifestations of the democratic nature of the Soviet representative system is the implementation of the orders of the electorate, which, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the session of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium held on 24 February, are a vivid manifestation of our democracy, a democracy not of words but of deeds, an actual and real democracy. "The orders," he noted, "express the concern of the working people with the affairs of their state and the public interest."

One of the first stipulations of the USSR constitution is contained in the article which codifies the leading and guiding role of the communist party in the socialist political system. As the acknowledged leader of the working people, the CPSU applies the methods of democratic leadership creatively in all its comprehensive activities, in strict accordance with the constitution and within its framework. The open and concealed enemies of communism have always launched their efforts to undermine the socialist

system by rejecting the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. They have considered the existence of a single ruling party in our country only in terms of an alleged aspiration to increase and broaden "control over society," regarding the party itself as an "instrument" for the exercise of "totalitarian power" and "dictatorship." Comrade L. I. Brezhnev quite properly rejected these fabrications at the Seventh Extraordinary USSR Supreme Soviet Session, which summarized the results of the nationwide discussion of the draft constitution. "The communist party," he recalled, "is the vanguard of the Soviet people. It is the most conscientious and progressive part of them, and indivisible from the people as a whole. The party has no interests other than those of the people. Trying to pit the party and people against each other and speaking of 'party dictatorship' is like, for example, opposing the heart to the rest of the human body."

The defenders of the "free world" often try to prove that the execution of the "majority will" in state policy is ensured by the multiparty system and interparty struggle. In reality, however, to a great extent the rivalry among the bourgeois parties in a capitalist society is designed to lead the proletariat and the nonproletarian exploited masses away from the struggle to achieve their basic interests, while meanwhile giving the impression that all population groups and strata are participating in politics. The principal means of achieving this objective is the skillfully organized political game in which attention is focused on individual and sometimes false differences under "pluralist" conditions, and so on. As the practical experience of contemporary bourgeois countries reveals, the existence of two or more parties and a parliamentary opposition is not in itself any guarantee whatsoever of democracy, preventing neither manifestations of racism and right-wing extremism nor cruel persecution of progressive forces and the gross violation of elementary civil rights and freedoms.

Meanwhile, the characteristic feature of the multiparty system in the Western countries is the illogical nature of the results of the scattering of electoral votes, which often prevents any single party or group from winning a parliamentary majority. This has been noted even by bourgeois researchers.

In principle, socialism does not exclude a multiparty system. Should specific historical conditions lead to this form in political life, it could be utilized extensively with a view to ensuring social unity and resolving constructive problems, under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party. This is most convincingly confirmed by the fruitful practice in Bulgaria, the GDR, and other socialist countries. A multiparty system was also tried in the Soviet state, in the initial stage of its development. However, lacking adequate sociopolitical prerequisites, this system failed to justify its existence in our country. As a result of the antipopular position adopted by the left-wing Eser leadership, it proved incompatible with reality itself, and with all the revolutionary-transforming activities of the multimillion strong toiling masses. They became convinced, through practical experience, of the ability of Lenin's great party to play the role of their political vanguard successfully. It

was the comprehensive and vast activities of the communist party which led the Soviet state to the heights of social progress. Always -- in the historic days of the October Revolution, in the intensive years of the civil war and foreign intervention, during the terrible period of the Great Patriotic War, and in periods of peaceful socialist construction -- the party has been the inspirer and organizer of the victories and achievements of the Soviet people. In the course of the discussion of the constitutional draft, our people expressed their heartfelt approval and total support of the CPSU and its policy, asserting yet once again and most emphatically, the irreversible nature of the historical choice made.

III

The criteria for the assessment of the nature of any constitution are not only the democratic principles and freedoms it proclaims, but also the practical guarantees, objective prerequisites, and conditions provided for the implementation of the concepts promulgated. If we compare our fundamental law with the constitutions of the leading bourgeois countries on the basis of these criteria, it will immediately be clear where the concern for man is true and real and where it is false and imaginary. It is no accident that the bourgeois constitutions contain no articles on the basic features of the socioeconomic structure of the society or the directions of the activities of the state. As a rule they include a very scanty and lame formulation of the socioeconomic rights of man which constitute the basis of his activities.

In discussing bourgeois constitutions, we must realize that not by any means everything they contain coincides with the true state of affairs. "A fictitious constitution exists," Lenin explained, "when the law and reality differ. A constitution is not fictitious when they coincide" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 17, p 345). Many bourgeois politicians and ideologues themselves acknowledge, with cynical frankness, the unrealistic and fictitious nature of bourgeois constitutions which formulate concepts and justify the potential abandonment of certain principles and provisions, which enables the bourgeoisie to "maneuver extensively within the constitutional framework."

By virtue of its nature, capitalism inevitably dooms the toiling classes and strata to dependence on the owners of productive capital. This is why the apologetic theories concerning "universal blossoming" and "prosperity" have always been and remain a deliberate means of misleading the popular masses. Despite the claims of their authors, social difficulties, lack of security, and impoverishment remain the constant concomitants of life for the working people in the "free world." Unemployment, complicated by rampant inflation and spiraling increases in the prices of consumer goods, have become the real tragedy of many millions of people in the West.

Even where it appears democratic, the bourgeois system supports and attempts to maintain a situation in which the socially enslaved cannot change their status. This is the essence of the capitalist order. Whatever myths are

employed to conceal that nature, it is nonetheless manifested again and again with inexorable consistency. The result is that the variety in the forms of bourgeois constitutions and their beautiful slogans referring to liberty, equality, and justice exist as if in a void, isolated from real life. They can neither change nor humanize the inflexible law of capitalist life: all goods accrue to those who have money.

This was carefully noted as early as the 19th Century by the Russian revolutionary democrat N. G. Chernyshevskiy. "...Liberalism conceives of freedom in a rather narrow, purely formal way," he wrote. In this concept freedom consists of an abstract right, permission granted on paper, and the lack of any juridical ban. Liberalism does not want to recognize that legal permission has no value to an individual unless he has the material means of using that permission. Neither you the reader nor I have been forbidden to eat our food from a gold dinner service. But unfortunately neither of us has or in all probability will ever have the funds needed to implement this fine notion. For this reason I say frankly that I have no wish at all for the right to a gold dinner service, and would sell that right for a single silver ruble, or even less. Where the people are concerned, this precisely is the value of all those rights the liberals proclaim."

In the United States today, one percent of the population has an income eight times that of a half of that population. Fewer than 2 percent of the citizens own more than 80 percent of the corporation stock. The incomes of 37 million citizens of the United States fall below the official poverty level. The fate of the old, the young, and the racial and ethnic minorities is particularly harsh.

In this light, the reaction of many organs of the Western press to the USSR constitution becomes understandable, in the main, and natural, in its way. In particular, it is not surprising that numerous comments either ignore or belittle the right to work which is supported by firm new guarantees, the right to education, health care, housing, and other services, which are clearly codified in our fundamental law. How could this be countered, for example, in the FRG, where not only is the right to work not codified in the constitution, but also a simple request for work on the part of the working people can be prosecuted as an action hostile to the system, and where "professional bans" are one of the practical aspects of the policy pursued by the ruling circles? Jacques Denis, the French researcher, is entirely right in reaching the conclusion that "professional bans" reveal the ever increasing aspiration of the major entrepreneurs and the state which serves them to ensure their total domination of society, a desire which is growing ever stronger as a result of the crisis.

The inequality of women has been and remains the shame of the capitalist world. Even in the countries which are best developed economically, women are essentially employed in unskilled and poorly paid positions. As before, the gap between male employment and female employment remains great in France, Sweden, Austria, the FRG, the United States, and Japan.

The supporters of capitalism have no cause to boast in the realm of relations within the nations either. Within the framework of the "Western democracies," such disgusting phenomena as racism and chauvinism are left entirely untouched. As before, the mass of the black, or "colored," population in the United States finds itself in a difficult position. This applies to material production, where wages paid to blacks are substantially lower than the wages of white workers, and also the realms of education, medical services, and social security, where harsh discrimination based on race prevails. The other racial and national minorities are equally without rights. The "colored" population of Great Britain is subjected to broad and systematic discrimination. Rhodesia and South Africa are two countries in the capitalist world where segregation and the Apartheid system have been officially raised to the level of state doctrine.

In the USSR, each of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the constitution is supported by legal and material guarantees. Our constitution most convincingly demonstrates that socialism of itself opens up truly boundless opportunities for the comprehensive, fruitful, and useful activities of the people, providing them with interesting and satisfying work and material security on the basis of the quantity and quality of labor done, and ~~and~~ creating effective and real methods for participation in the administration of social and governmental affairs.

Bourgeois propaganda responded to the publication of the draft constitution and its nationwide discussion and adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet by intensifying its campaign concerning the alleged violations of human rights in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The class roots of this campaign are extremely clear. It is being supported by an effort to undermine the faith of the working people in the capitalist part of the world in real socialism and its accomplishments, triumphs, and politics, and to destroy the internal unity of the socialist comity.

Falsely proclaiming the defense of human rights to be its slogan, the bourgeoisie is investing it with its own class meaning, concealed behind the screen of "universal ideals," and as Marx wrote, representing "its own special interests as general interests" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 3, p 167). Discarding the verbal skin, the meat of what the bourgeoisie is trying to defend in this campaign is the continuation of the existing economic and political status of the ruling class and its actual role in all fields of contemporary life and ownership of the material and spiritual wealth it has usurped from the people. The bourgeoisie is trying to strengthen and perpetuate the whole complex of its rights or, more accurately, its omnipotent power to impose its attitude toward human rights as a supposedly permanent, universal, and supraclass institution in every regard. Adamantly indoctrinating the masses with such self-seeking postulates, the bourgeois propagandists presume as their basis that the actual situation of the working people, and their rights and freedoms, or, more accurately, their actual rightlessness, will be fixed and permanent forever.

Such is the main objective being pursued in the course of the continuing campaign.

Frequently neofascist views are disseminated in the West under the banner of unrestrained and semianarchic "freedom of opinion." The cult of violence, sadism, pornography, and similar phenomena which lead toward the world of unrestrained subhuman instincts and passions is promoted intensively. It is precisely from a position of individualistic willfulness that the bourgeois ideologues preach, particularly in publications destined for foreign readers, the message of the right to "think differently," the infinite nature of the "horizons of political polemics," and so on. The very concept of freedom itself is sometimes identified solely with "freedom to dissent." For example, in the course of the discussions of the draft USSR constitution, THE NEW YORK TIMES tried to represent the fact that "it makes the activities of dissidents less acceptable" as a flaw in it. Many other spokesmen of the monopolies also have expressed their displeasure with the fact that freedom of speech and criticism in our country is oriented toward the strengthening of the socialist system and the successful solution of the problems in the building of communism.

The founders of scientific communism frequently emphasized that man, as an individual with specific and personal characteristics, will always remain a member of the social collective. By virtue of this fact, man's true freedom cannot be separated from his responsibility to society. Soviet laws and our entire system not only proclaim but guarantee in fact the type of rights which neither exist nor could exist in any bourgeois country. As a result, the freedom of the individual under socialism is a reality characterized by factual economic, political, and spiritual liberation of the citizen. Under socialism, the entire organization of social and state life not only does not exclude freedom of expression and the conflict of opinions, and the political representation of classes, social, and professional social groups, but it is also directed toward maximal expression of the people's initiative and the manifestation and proper consideration of public opinion on all basic problems on a national scale.

Our party and the Soviet state approach the problem of "freedom of opinion" under socialism not in terms of an abstract "dissidence," corresponding to the usual concepts and criteria of bourgeois democracy, but in terms of an efficient, interested, and if necessary, sharply critical attitude toward the negative facts and phenomena in our life, with a view to eliminating them as rapidly as possible in the interests of the working people and the successful solution of the problems in the building of communism. It is this approach precisely which enjoys the full support and warm approval of all the Soviet people. In a socialist society, the right to criticize carries a powerful positive charge. It is an effective tool for the improvement of social relations and a necessary prerequisite for the normal activities of all democratic institutions. This is why the communist party always devotes close attention to the development of criticism. This institution is approached in the USSR constitution from

the viewpoint of ensuring the right of the citizens to participate effectively in the administration of governmental and social affairs. For example, the constitution strictly prohibits any kind of persecution because of criticism.

Meanwhile, the process of the degeneration of democracy is manifested ever more clearly in the capitalist countries in the systematic replacement of legality -- an inviolable element in political democracy -- by illegality and arbitrary action, and the persecution of those supporting progressive views and convictions. In the United States, the CIA and the FBI maintain files on tens of millions of American citizens, many of whom would be arrested immediately in the event of "extraordinary circumstances." In France, information on millions of individuals has been stored in the "electronic memory" of a computer used by the police control organs. As a result of the infamous FRG Decree "On Radical Elements," millions of citizens have suffered a humiliating "reliability" investigation and many officials have been fired from their government posts for "dissident thinking." In many Western countries, the security organs and the police infiltrate agents into various political parties and social organizations which are functioning legally, opening their mail, tapping telephone lines, and engaging in other illegal invasions of the public and private lives of the citizens. Bourgeois justice also suffers from serious defects. The system persecutes those fighting for civil rights and sometimes closes its eyes to the true crimes by the powerful rich.

The cloak of the fighter for human rights hardly fits the spokesmen for imperialism. In a society in which everything is based on selfish material aims and on buying and selling, the advocacy of lofty moral ideals by the ruling classes cannot fail to be hypocritical. "The United States is emerging as the worst offender against human rights the world has ever seen," was the conclusion reached by the famous American publicist (K.) Lightfoot in a recently published book entitled "Human Rights American Style." Even though the forces of progress have been able to achieve a certain success in recent years in the defense of their interests, as a result of adamant struggle, it is civil rights precisely which are still the target in the most frequent encroachments by the monopoly bourgeoisie. As practical experience has indicated, not even curtailed democracy suits the capitalist magnates today, for whenever they see fit, they do not hesitate to violate that democracy, committing any crime in pursuit of their egotistical purposes.

"Democracy is of tremendous importance to the struggle of the working class against the capitalists to win its liberation," Lenin emphasized in the book "State and Revolution." However, democracy is not by any means a limit, but rather one of the stages along the path from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism to communism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 99). This broad statement defines the truly scientific approach to the problem of democracy under the conditions of a bourgeois society. These words contain the key to the understanding of the profound meaning of the struggle being waged by the working class and the communists for a democratic renovation, the most important landmark along the path toward social liberation.

Asserting true democracy, the new USSR constitution implements the socialist concepts of civil rights and freedoms in their entirety and unity, exposing for the whole world the hypocrisy and falsehood in bourgeois democracy and revealing the unquestionable advantages of a society in which real freedom and justice prevail. The dynamism, power, humanism, and peacefulness of the developed socialist society constitute an inexhaustible and life-giving source of historical optimism, confidence, and strength for the Soviet people. Imbuing their way of life and thoughts, these outstanding qualities and features found their highest embodiment in the new fundamental law of the Soviet state. Confronting its great truth, the lies and slanders of our enemies are powerless.

5003

CSO: 1802

FROM 'CONVERGENCE' THEORY TO 'PLANETARY CONSCIOUSNESS;' CLASS NATURE OF
BOURGEOIS THEORY EVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 101-110

[Article by V. Smolyanskiy, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences]

[Text] Mankind has entered the seventh decade of the Great October Revolution, the epoch of the universal-historical transition from capitalism to socialism. This is occurring under conditions of simultaneously continuing changes in the circumstances in the international arena in favor of the forces of peace, democracy, and social progress, with the ever clearer hopelessness of attempts to exert military, economic, and political pressure on the Soviet Union and the entire socialist comity, the struggle between the two social systems on the ideological front, in an area in which there neither is nor could there be any peaceful coexistence, is assuming particular gravity.

This confrontation, logically stemming from the irreconcilable nature of opposite class concepts, has its objective laws. They reflect irreversible changes in the deployment and ratio of forces to the detriment of contemporary capitalism, and the steady growth of the power and prestige of existing socialism, combined with the unparalleled development of the international communist and workers' movements, and the liberation struggle of the peoples. One of the objective laws is that, with the acceleration of the historical process and the broadened influence of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, bourgeois social science and imperialist propaganda are giving ever-greater priority to the ideas of reformism, of "reorganization" of the capitalist system in such a way as to enable it to counter as extensively as possible its socialist opposite, the new system which is inevitably coming to replace the old.

In other words, the old concepts which, one way or another, denied the historical legitimacy of the victory and development of socialism, failed. Gradually, the defense of imperialism--even though contradictorily, with zig-zags, is shifting from conformist to reformist, bourgeois-liberal positions. The main class objective here is to depict capitalism as a more attractive system offering its specific advantages, and ascribe to existing

socialism the antagonistic contradictions and organic vices inherent in bourgeois society.

This is precisely the objective which determines today the development of the basic trends, of the evolution of bourgeois ideological currents.

1.

The theory of "convergence," which predicts the "spontaneous convergence," "synthesis," and "merger" of opposite socio-economic systems as a result of the scientific and technical revolution, and progress toward a certain "third" system which, allegedly, would embrace the best features of both theories, remains the pivot of bourgeois reformism.

Considering some problems arising under capitalism and socialism as a result of the development of production forces and intensified socialization and internationalization of production processes (such as problems of production management, scientific and technological development, urbanization of social life, social mobility, and increased communications and inter-governmental relations), the authors of the various alternatives of this theory ignore the essential difference between the socio-economic conditions under which such problems are resolved under socialism and under capitalism. The methodology of the entire "convergence" concept is linked by a single feature: the laws of social development, inseparably linked with evolutionary and revolutionary changes in production and social relations among people, are replaced by the laws governing the development of equipment and technology. By this token these concepts reduce to naught the conflict between the social systems. According to their logic, however, the "merger" of socialism with capitalism should take place on a capitalist basis, i.e., on the basis of the private ownership of productive capital.

According to this methodology the ideological defenders of monopoly capital must take the moods of the masses into consideration. In order to increase the propaganda value of their preachings, they are using ever more extensively concepts such as "revolution," "socialism," "humanistic technology," and "acts in the interest of society and the working man."

Yet, social practice itself exposes--the farther the more so--the falsehood of the "convergence" theory. It cannot withstand criticism not only on the part of Marxists but on the part of the realistically thinking bourgeoisie as well. It is precisely this that explains the major amendments introduced in its contemporary variants, while preserving its essence and methodology. Today the existence of a "hybrid society" is forecast not for the immediate historical future but beyond the range of the "visible horizon of social progress." This is substantiated by the fact that "convergence" as such would be legitimate but only "to a very limited extent" and that "in the immediate future we could hope only for a rapprochement but not a merger between the two systems." Greater emphasis is put on their "reciprocal adaptation," and "gradual evolution."

Let us recall that the idea of "convergence" was also the base of D. Bell's theory of "post-industrial society." Thus, in a collection of previous works by this American professor, "The Advent of the Post-Industrial Society," published as early as 1973, which included the previously unpublished final section, "The Future on the Agenda," claimed that the society as conceived by the author did not present the picture of something specific but was merely an analytical structure aimed at recording some trends of social organization in Western countries. It was stated immediately that a "post-industrial civilization" could be neither capitalist nor socialist, and that it was a new dimension of social life covering both competing systems.

One and a half years before this, in his speech at a symposium held in Zurich on the subject of "Technocracy and Politics," D. Bell had said that "socialist and capitalist societies, representing varieties of an industrial system, could converge in their economic development and provide a type of centralized-decentralized market-planned system."

The theory of the "post-industrial society" was merely a stage in development of the "convergence" idea. Its methodology is the broadest and most complete of all attempts to pit against Marxism-Leninism the concept of a certain surrogate of political, social, economic and philosophical views.

Preaching "convergence," the supporters of the old world are expressing themselves ever more loudly in favor of the abatement of the class struggle and the shaping of the "new man" "in a new technological environment." It is noteworthy that these and similar theses, most promising from the viewpoint of the interests of the monopolistic bourgeoisie, are presented as a "global imperative," the result of a certain "values revolution," as a panacea, the only one capable of solving the problems of "universal interdependence," the requirements of the "planetary modernization" and the "space era," and so on.

Characteristically, the thesis of the "abatement of the ideological struggle" is being promoted even now, when a sharp turn is taking place in bourgeois social science and propaganda from "de-ideologization," suitable for the initial stages in the development of the "convergence" theory to "re-ideologization" or, more specifically, to the open yet more refined imposition of bourgeois values on the social, economic, and political processes of our time.

The concept of "Europeanism" is a characteristic variant of the "convergence" theory. It presumes the introduction in the healthy organism of popular rule of the socialist countries of central and southeastern Europe the norms and principles of bourgeois law. Speculating on possibilities for economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation under the conditions of detente, the bourgeois and some right-wing socialist ideologs are hoping that these countries will become "synthesized" with the capitalist part of the European continent.

The idea that this would put an end to any imaginary "human rights violations" under socialism is being imposed in this connection in all possible ways. The French historian E. Todd, distinguished by his particularly malicious anti-communism, has gone so far as to link the "rebirth of the freedom of the individual and of democratic rights" in the Soviet Union to no more and no less than the "fall of the existing system." This dyed-in-the-wool reactionary bases the restoration of capitalism on "the observance of human rights."

The same petty ideas, this time concealed behind the fig leaf of abandoning the "restoration of the capitalist order," are promoted also by D. Pitterman, former noted leader of the Socialist International. He favors the "growth" of the socialist countries within a system of "democratic socialism." He opposes the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist parties and appeals for the organization and energizing of a "socialist opposition." Appeals may be heard for interaction with the internal opponents of socialism. This "unity of action" is required in order to try to convert the new system into a society of "humane socialism" and thus to create a "single European system" consisting of the two conflicting social systems.

This clearly reveals the inertia of the previous stage of ideological struggle, when the ideologs of the monopoly bourgeoisie tried to implement its strategic tasks under the banner of "building bridges," "absorption of the Eastern system by Western-type systems," and "hybridization" as a result of the exchange of experience in technology, economics, and social organization (assisted by the now-defunct Pitirim Sorokin, on the failure of whose petit bourgeois views V. I. Lenin wrote in his time).

The joint efforts of the socialist states led to substantial progress in the normalization of international circumstances, strengthening European security, and developing good neighborly relations among the countries in this continent. The socialist countries are interested in achieving with their partners a uniform approach to a number of basic international problems. However, this does not mean in the least that they would ever accept the theory of "convergence," or the anti-socialist concept of "Europeanism." Struggling for the further strengthening of the peace and security of the nations, they do not intend in the least to ignore the undividable class comity of their historical destinies. There neither is nor could there be any above-class, non-socialist and non-capitalist ideology. There is the ideology of the contemporary monopoly bourgeoisie, expressing the interests of big capital, and there is the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the outlook of the working-class--the vanguard of the toiling masses. An adamant struggle is being waged between them for the minds and hearts of the people, a struggle whose outcome has been historically predetermined in favor of communism.

The defenders of the old world understand this perfectly and are doing everything possible to delay their inevitable defeat. Forced to convert

to defense, they are seeking new methods with which to manipulate the minds of the people. Here again, however, their possibilities are becoming ever more limited.

2.

The strategies and tactics of "convergence" and of "capitalist infiltration" in the socialist countries under the flag of a "peaceful penetration" suffered a devastating failure. This was particularly clearly manifested in the finale of the 1968 Czechoslovak crisis, deplorable for the anti-communists. In the capitalist countries themselves the intensity of the class struggle of the working people against monopoly rule increased. Along with economic upheavals, the bourgeois society faced an unparalleled ideological and political crisis.

Under those circumstances the defenders of the old world undertook the molding of a new conservatism, distinguished from the old largely by borrowing a number of petit bourgeois reformist ideas. That same D. Bell and people like him, who, until recently, were still supporting "convergence," found themselves among the main theoreticians of neoconservatism.

The class nature of neoconservatism is revealed in a typical type of logic: the masses are "irrational" by virtue of the fact alone that they are not satisfied with their gains, always demanding more, thus disturbing social stability, for which reason they should be restrained in order to block any aspiration on the part of the working people to improve their position and to undertake the revolutionary reorganization of society. For the time being such views are improved by terminology borrowed from fashionable pseudo-scientific liberal-bourgeois fabrications.

Having become the tool of modern capitalism, the doctrine of neoconservatism is being extensively used by the social democratic right wing as well. Thus, in the FRG its promotion is combined with the promotion of a "third way," and of all sorts of reformists variants of "convergence." A "reciprocal enrichment" between bourgeois and right-wing socialist ideology is taking place.

Inherent in West German neoconservatism, as in the American one, is a popularization of "social order," and, frequently, of the "strong individual" as factors needed in restraining manifestations of "anti-social human nature," which means, above all, the struggle of the working people headed by the communists against monopoly oppression. H. Kaltenbrunner, the noted ideolog supporting this direction, asserts, however, that it is not a question of going back to the threadbare anti-communism of the cold war period. He calls for "subjecting communism to creative criticism." Proclaiming that private ownership is no longer a fetish, he immediately adds that it is only under the conditions of a bourgeois society and a market economy that individual freedom is guaranteed, for which reason one must be "tolerant" of capitalism.

Yet, at every step life itself refutes the legend of the benefits of the capitalist system. The dictate of the monopolies and their direct invasion of the realm of socio-economic relations clearly prove the worth of the praised bourgeois democracy which has always been limited and which now, essentially, is becoming even more inefficient. The entire practice of the capitalist way of life confirms the historical justice of Lenin's words that the slogan of freedom and equality, while ignoring the private ownership of productive capital, is the falsehood and hypocrisy of the bourgeois society which conceals behind an official recognition of freedom and equality the factual and the economic lack of freedom and equality for the workers and for all working and exploited people by capital, i.e., the tremendous majority of the population in all capitalist countries (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, pp 425-426).

To prove this it would suffice to mention mass unemployment, "profession bans"--the impossibility to find a job because of a person's progressive political convictions--and other deprivations of basic human rights by the working people.

Like many other currents, neoconservatism has chosen as an instrument of ideological struggle the provocative sensationalism of alleged "violations of human rights" by the socialist countries. This is no temporary circumstantial campaign but a long-term course aimed at discrediting the very idea of the vanguard role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party. Here and there this course has been raised to the level of a state norm. Thus, as early as August 1977 the American Senator D. Moynihan, former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, proclaimed in the journal COMMENTARY that "the defense of human rights" must be "as indivisible a part of American foreign policy as Marxism-Leninism is to the Soviet Union." Such a formulation of the problem which, translated into practical language, means an encroachment on the principles of inter-governmental relations agreed upon in Helsinki, and an interference in domestic affairs, was condemned by a number of Western European allies of the United States.

This interference is firmly opposed by socialism which, having established the rule of the working people, created a true democracy and built it on immeasurably stronger and more viable foundations compared with capitalism.

In the course of the ideological struggle against neoconservatism, the Soviet communists do not ignore in the least cases in which the actions of individual citizens sharply conflict with the way of life of our society which, naturally, is forced to use against such people the punitive norms of the laws and measures of moral condemnation. The socialist social way of life as a whole, in which contradictions are non-antagonistic, does not exclude in some cases, as was predicted by K. Marx, manifestations of individual antagonism (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 13, pp 7-8), namely renegades--literally isolated cases--who, influenced by capitalist propaganda, adopted the value orientations and ideals of the

capitalist world and whose behavior visibly reflects the vestiges of the old system.

Yes, the enemies of socialism have still not abandoned the hope of undermining the Soviet system or perhaps to hinder its development. Along with attempts at exerting political and economic pressure, they use the bogey of "dissidence" in their desire to erode and weaken the communist convictions of the Soviet people, impose upon them alien views and mores, and, in the final account, achieve political and social changes in our society suitable to imperialism.

A socialist way of life means that the people, headed by the communist party, are the main makers of all accomplishments, rather than the "elite" as is the case in bourgeois society. It is precisely the broad toiling masses that exercise the power and embody the highest type of democracy. This historical fact was specifically reflected in the great charter of the builders of communism--the new USSR constitution. The defense of the rights and freedoms of the individual is one of the basic tasks of the Soviet state. In an effort to prove the opposite, the imperialist ideologs, the neoconservatives, and other reactionaries expose themselves in the eyes of the people and the public of their own countries.

It is no accident that the neoconservative philosophy is being sharply criticized in the West. Many progressive authors note that this is an ideological-political current aimed at shaping an anti-democratic way of thinking. Until recently today's supporters of this current in the FRG feared like fire the word "conservative," which was associated with Hitlerite national socialism. Today they openly use the slogan of "freedom of the individual" in attacking the forces of progress, claiming that the broader the field of activity of democratic institutions becomes, the worse the situation of the individual becomes . . .

Exposing the class nature of neoconservatism, the scientists in the GDR have characterized it as yet another symptom of the ideological and political crisis of capitalism, as a historical category. It does not express in the least any kind of abstract human aspiration to retain the social status quo. Despite all differences in views and approaches, resulting in sharp discussions, the neoconservatives and their critics in the non-Marxist camp are united by anti-communism and the related bourgeois understanding of democracy. The critics of neoconservatism who do not hold Marxist positions reduce the entire matter to a purely speculative consideration of its basic stipulations, functions, and prospects. Yet, the truly scientific analysis of its class foundations and functions as the ideological weapon of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its allies is of decisive significance in this case.

3.

The failure of the "convergence" ideas and the exposure of neoconservatism did not put an end to bourgeois-liberal attempts to find a more or less complete alternative to the socialist way of development which would cover the entire planet and all realms of social activity. Today such attempts are characterized by a switch from the "convergence" methodology to the methodology of the formulation of a "planetary consciousness," a concept of "globalism" and "planet-wide society." This is precisely the method relied upon for surmounting the "spiritual crisis" in the capitalist world and impose upon mankind some kind of order based on "Western values," i.e., once again, on the economic, political, and ideological foundations of capitalism. The bourgeois ideologs engage in speculations on problems of social and scientific and technical progress. Currently the latter include global problems affecting the interests of both world systems.

They are relying on interrelated demographic, food, energy, and raw material and ecological problems. It is self-evident that their effective solution on a global scale would be inconceivable on an isolated basis. Thus, according to the scientists, naturally, a discussion of the energy problem and of the task of supplying the population on earth with energy or raw materials for the production of energy would require an assessment of the growth rates of the world's population and its individual groups, a consideration of the influence of respective sources of energy on the environment, and other factors.

The approach to these problems should be based on the fact that, according to available estimates, by the end of the century the earth's population will have increased from four to six billion people, that the economic backwardness of Asian, African, and Latin American countries, created by colonialism, has not been surmounted as yet, and that man must be protected from the many dangers of further uncontrolled technical development. These are entirely realistic and very serious problems whose gravity will increase with every new decade unless a sensible collective solution may be found through systematic international cooperation.

"The socialist part of the world," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "gives a good example through its internal development and approach to international relations of the ways which would offer the best solutions to the major problems facing mankind. However, naturally, it alone would not resolve such problems for all mankind. This requires the purposeful efforts of all countries and the extensive and constructive cooperation among all countries and nations. The Soviet Union entirely favors such cooperation. Looking deeper, we could see in this the content of the foreign political course which we describe as a course of peaceful coexistence."

The statement is extremely clear. However, such an approach obviously does not suit the enemies of socialism. They are trying to ascribe to the entire

world the crisis and disorders of capitalism. Yet, everyone can see that production is periodically reduced, unemployment is growing, and upheavals are occurring in all fields of life not in the world of socialism, with its dynamism, but in the capitalist world, with the aggravation of its general crisis.

Under the capitalist way of life the very system of relations between man and environment are determined, as in all other areas, by considerations of profit, private ownership of the land, water, subsoil, and capital goods, and fierce rivalry.

Naturally, factual socialism also faces problems of improving ecological and other similar conditions of activities. It is not guaranteed against errors and cannot always resolve all such problems immediately. However, the advantage of the new system is that it is inseparable from a scientifically substantiated system of relations between society and nature and the rational utilization of natural resources. In our country the protection of nature has been elevated to the rank of state policy.

Such is the objective side of the matter. Yet, there is a subjective side as well. It is manifested in the fact that the need to resolve global problems on the basis of cooperation between the members of the two world systems is used in the West to substantiate the need for the rejection of a Marxist-Leninist outlook and a class approach to contemporary social processes.

Thus, the famous American ideolog Z. Brezezinski, U.S. presidential assistant for national security, raised the question, in an October 1977 speech in Bonn, of cooperation for the solution of global problems based on "gradual changes in outlook and objective conditions governing human existence." He emphasized the intention of "reasserting the leading role of the United States in world affairs," and the aspiration to "resurrect some of the most important spiritual values and of the historical roots of our society and, at the same time, the readoption by the West of conditions common to all mankind." A great deal in this speech drew the attention of the observers. Among others, however, they did not fail to note one circumstance: a listing no longer toward the "hybrid" of socialism with capitalism, but toward a different allegedly qualitatively different "global" system.

In a word, the communists and their allies are asked gradually to abandon the revolutionary ideology of the working class for the sake of such a "world community" in which American imperialism would rule and whose "historical roots" and "spiritual values"--the set of ideas of the contemporary monopoly bourgeoisie--would be the foundations of a "planetary consciousness."

Whereas seven years ago, in his book "Between Two Centuries: The Role of America in the Technotronic Era," Z. Brezezinski claimed that "the new

planetary consciousness is only beginning to gain an influence," and that "its objectives are still short of clarity, unity, and precision," and that "the majority of mankind--the factual majority--does not share it and is not as yet ready to do so," judging by his speech in Bonn, now he has assumed the mission of concretizing the strategic tasks and functions of the "planetary consciousness."

The class struggle in the field of ideology is proclaimed anachronistic by those same theoreticians who promote bourgeois concepts under the guise of "global thinking" and extend solutions of a natural scientific, technological, and other nature to the socio-economic and socio-political areas. They praise the "global transformation" which would encompass the socialist countries and mark a transition to a "new trans-ideological consciousness." The refrain is the same: a class outlook is . . . an obsolete category.

The bourgeois concept of a "trans-national awareness" and the petty revisionist ideas of a "meta-ideology," which, allegedly, would be neither socialist nor capitalist, are being circulated under the false pretext of replacing a class approach to social phenomena with some kind of "universal," "above-system" approach.

Here is the way Gerhardt Hirschfeldt--the executive director of the Council for the Study of Mankind--which includes historians, sociologists, economists, and international affairs scientists from the United States, Britain, the FRG, Japan, and many other countries, including developing ones, formulates his postulates. In his book, "Nation: Growth and Survival. The First Cycle," he writes: "The initial steps in abolishing boundaries between people should consist of the broader and more tolerant understanding of the views held by others and the creation, on this basis, of a new art, new economy, new educational system, new religion, and new science. In each of these areas currents already exist aimed at humanity as a whole. Such currents and movements--supranational art styles and multinational corporations . . . should be comprehensively cultivated and developed. Meanwhile, we should realize that insufficient attention is being paid to two vitally important elements--I emphasize the primacy of mankind compared with any of its segments and the support, above all, not of nations, classes, or religions, but of mankind."

The author, to give him credit, also mentions many things which indeed express common human concern for the solution of global problems such as, for example, ensuring lasting peace on earth, and international scientific and technical and economic cooperation. However, when he discusses, for example, "supranational art styles" or other "non-class" concepts and institutions, his only purpose is purely to eliminate the problem of the class struggle waged by the proletariat and dull the class consciousness of the toiling masses.

In the final account, the concept of a "planetary society" and "planetary ideology" includes in the economic foundations of future mankind the

multinational monopolies. In other words, it leaves untouched the foundations of the exploiting system. In this case the bourgeois ideologists try to present the imperialist corporations as a "factor of peace and progress." Yet, in reality, their capitalist nature expresses itself at every step. As before, the monopolies are fighting for the division and redivision of the world's capitalist market in all its aspects (financial, commercial, and so on), and for the division and redivision of sources of raw materials and areas of utilization of capital and manpower. This has been, and remains, a constant source of tension in international relations.

In the monograph "Outlines of Political Strategy," published in the FRG in 1974, its author Kurt Bidekopf, secretary general and one of the main theoreticians of the CDU, approaches topical contemporary problems from the position of a "planetary ideology," in order somewhat to renovate his party's program-propaganda arsenal. He calls upon the international public not to be guided by the "categories and methods of the 19th century," such as statehood and national sovereignty. "The finite nature of the world and the outlines of a new world community," he claims, "already now question the validity of these categories."

The American philosopher and professor at the New School for Social Research (Kh. Yonas) expresses himself in the same spirit. He goes even further by proclaiming socialism as unsuitable to be a part of the "global community." Why? Because, as this personality claims in the journal SOCIAL RESEARCH (No 1, 1976), capitalism today is entirely different from what it was when Marx was formulating his revolutionary theory. According to him, it is not capitalism but socialism, which is gaining ever-greater victories in the creation of a new, communist civilization, that has become obsolete.

Naturally, not all "globalists" support the old school of "abstract" economists who rejected the legitimacy of socialism. Today many of them acknowledge the need to strengthen detente and the historical base of peaceful coexistence. They formulate their forecasts for the future on the basis of a sober consideration of the vital strength and great prospects of existing socialism. However, the majority among them regret the policy of detente, claiming that it has contributed nothing to "progress toward a global society," pitting against it a certain "alternative approach based on the values of global humanism," and preaching a "planetary political system" --a reactionary utopia which has nothing in common with true concern for the destinies of mankind.

Some "globalists" love to discuss extensively the "Soviet menace." They need such a falsifying myth to "substantiate" the exclusion of socialism from the "world community." This would "resolve" "planetary problems" more comfortably, in the capitalist image. However, this path is both unrealistic and not serious. The problems of mankind could be resolved only on the basis of sober realism and constructive cooperation among countries belonging to different social systems.

Such is precisely the type of cooperation promoted by the Soviet Union. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev re-emphasized this at the joint ceremonious meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and RSFSR Supreme Soviet: "We actively and persistently call for the argument between socialism and capitalism to be resolved not on the battlefield or armament conveyor belts but in the realm of peaceful toil. We want to see not missiles with nuclear warheads crossing the borders of these two worlds but the threads of extensive and comprehensive cooperation for the good of all mankind. Systematically implementing this policy, we are implementing one of the most important slogans of the October Revolution and Lenin's legacy: Peace to the nations!"

New and outstanding possibilities may be opened to the people on earth and prerequisites may appear for the solution of many other vitally important problems facing today all mankind only following the solution of the main problem--that of preventing a new world war and ensuring a lasting peace.

The further changes in the ratio of forces in the world arena in favor of socialism, the increased influence of Marxist-Leninist ideas throughout the globe, and the turn to the left of the toiling masses in the capitalist countries force the imperialist bourgeoisie to seek and use concepts which could draw over to its side various social strata. It is this that explains the evolution of bourgeois ideological currents from "pure" "convergence" to "planetary consciousness." The class nature and functions of such currents are, in the final account, one and the same: to preserve the bourgeois rule, and achieve the "capitalist evolution" of socialism and the abandonment by the working people of a revolutionary ideology. However, all attempts to turn back the course of the historical process are doomed to failure.

At every step life confirms the correctness of the conclusion drawn at the 25th party congress to the effect that the bourgeois society has no future. The time of the total replacement of capitalism by socialism on a worldwide scale is nearing with the same objective natural law as it itself, in its time, replaced feudalism. The ideological dead-ends and confusions of the bourgeoisie and the inability of its defenders to answer the historical challenge of the new system more or less intelligently are among the many symptoms of this.

5003

CSO: 1802

CONSTRUCTIVE POWER OF LIBERATED LABOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78, pp 111-120

[Review by N. Kozhanov of the book "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [selected speeches and articles] by F. D. Kulakov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 463 pp]

[Text] Our time is truly packed with historical events. The Soviet people are working persistently and adamantly on the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, and other stipulations of the new USSR constitution. The documents of the December 1977 party Central Committee Plenum, and the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee letter on the development of the socialist competition for the fulfillment and over-fulfillment of the 1978 Plan and intensifying the struggle for upgrading production effectiveness and work quality, and the speeches of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, during his trip in Siberia and the Far East, and at the 18th Leninist Komsomol Congress have become a battle program for action in our lives. Each of our accomplishments and the infinite number of our plans are an ever-greater manifestation of the great constructive power of Marxist-Leninist theories which have become the active invincible force of the builders of a new society, and an effective instrument for the study and reorganization of the world.

This very close interconnection between theory and practice has been vividly manifested in the implementation of the Leninist political course formulated at the October 1964 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and comprehensively developed at the 23rd, 24th, and 25th party congresses. The speeches, articles, and books by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, and the other party and state leaders contribute to the interpretation and profound mastery of the tremendous creative contribution made by the CPSU during those years to the theory and practice of the building of communism and of the very rich experience in party, state, and economic construction gained in the conditions of the mature socialist society.

The collection of selected articles and speeches by F. D. Kulakov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary,

published by Politizdat, cover a broad range of socio-political and economic problems of the developed socialist stage. The collected speeches delivered at different times (the work covers the period from 1965 to 1977) powerfully describe the dynamics of our construction, and the tremendous and varied activities of the party, its Central Committee, and Central Committee Politburo, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, aimed at the all-round development of the socialist economy, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and the improved effectiveness of social production and the quality of all our work. The supreme objective pursued through the effort, concern, and aspirations of the party is the further growth of the prosperity and culture of the Soviet people and the education of the new man--the active and worthy builder of a communist society--may be traced throughout the collection.

The book opens with two speeches: "Leninism--The Great Constructive Force of the Building of Communism," and "The Light of the Great October Revolution Illuminates the Way to Communism." This is natural, for the former, dedicated to the 102nd anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth, is imbued with the pathos of a nationwide struggle for the implementation of the decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress and the preparations for the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The second speech was delivered on 5 November 1976, at the solemn session marking the 59th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. This was the year of the 25th Leninist party congress, the time of the beginning of the extensive and intensive work on the implementation of the great current five-year plan. Therefore, those dates mark important landmarks in the recently covered path and the reader is presented with an impressive picture of the accomplishments of the period. This is a dynamic picture, convincingly proving how, with each five-year plan, and year after year, socialism reveals to an ever-greater extent its possibilities as a system under which the planned organization of public production is aimed at ensuring the prosperity and all-round development of all members of society.

In the course of daily affairs and events we do not always feel to the fullest extent the scope and size of our progress. This particularly applies to relatively short time segments computed in terms of years. The documents collected in the book enable us to feel this rhythm more deeply, more tangibly. It is a progress from one level to another, from one peak to another. Let us take as an example the figures cited in the collection on one of the most important and complex sectors of our economy--agricultural production.

Reviewing in a speech on the occasion of a Leninist anniversary the results of the battle for the harvest in the first year of the Ninth Five-Year Plan (as we know, in 1971 weather conditions were not among the best), F. D. Kulakov noted: "One hundred eighty-one million tons of grain were harvested. Even though this may be somewhat less than what we hoped for, it is 13.6 million tons more than the average annual harvest over the Eighth Five-Year

Plan. The cotton crop totaled 7.1 million tons. This is the highest-ever cotton crop harvested in the country" (p 12).

Some five years went by. In the speech on the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, we see figures on the preliminary results of the work of grain growers in 1976--the first year of the 10th Five-Year Plan: "On 1 November the country had harvested over 220 million tons of grain. Furthermore, the corn and rice harvests are still underway in the southern part of the country. The state has received 91.8 million tons of grain or 5.6 billion poods" (p 29).

Let us point out that in 1976 again the weather was not very favorable. Great concern, among others, was caused by the long rain which fell during the harvest. The consequences of the most severe drought of the previous year were also being felt. However, the courage and persistence of the field workers and of their voluntary assistants among workers, students, and Soviet army troops, and the organizing efforts and great political work and personal example of the party members led to victory. Those days the profound speech delivered by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev at the conference of the party-economic aktiv of Kazakhstan, and his warm congratulations to production leaders, which stirred up the entire country, played then a tremendous role.

The new level reached by Soviet agriculture influenced cotton yields as well. "By the 59th anniversary of the October Revolution," the speech noted, "about eight million tons of cotton had already been delivered to the procurement centers. Nearly five million tons of this 'white gold' was grown by Uzbek cotton growers" (p 29).

As we know, in the second year of the current five-year plan the figure rose to 8.76 million tons!

These high results were achieved thanks to the course charted by the party of achieving a sharp upsurge in agricultural production, thanks to the selfless efforts of millions of working people in the countryside, and of the workers in all industrial sectors and the construction industry related to agriculture.

Many such comparisons may be made while reading the book. They clearly confirm the profound justice, political wisdom, and economic strategy shown by the party and the ability creatively to apply Marxist-Leninist doctrine in the new conditions of historical development, as well as persistence and consistency in our movement forward.

The collection provides a number of examples of the creative power of liberated labor and of the creative energy of the Soviet people. As early as March 1918 Vladimir Il'ich Lenin wrote: "... We cannot accurately even imagine at present the rich forces concealed within the toiling mass, ... the type of forces that are concealed and could develop with a

socialist social system" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, p 153).

Today the constructive forces of our society are becoming ever more apparent. The ideological and political unity and solidarity among all classes and social groups, the Leninist friendship among all nations and nationalities, the planned nature of our economy, a highly conscientious attitude toward labor and a socialist way of life are new forces brought to life by the Great October Socialist Revolution which gave them broad scope.

Addressing an electoral meeting at the Petrovskiy Electoral District in Stavropol'skiy Kray, F. D. Kulakov cited a curious document entitled "Wall Map of European Russia Showing the Nations and Their Industries." In the middle of this map, issued shortly before the October Revolution, stood a peasant wearing bast sandals. The boundaries of Stavropol'skiy Kray showed four symbols: a one horse-drawn ploughshare, an ear, a sheep, and two millstones respectively marked "agriculture," "wheat," "common sheep," and "milling." Such was before the revolution Stavropol's industrial aspect. Here the wool washing factory in Nevinnomyssk and a leather treatment plant employing 50 workers in Stavropol' were considered the biggest enterprises (see p 244).

Today, looking at the map of that same Stavropol'skiy Kray, we see some of the biggest enterprises of leading industrial sectors--chemical, petroleum, gas, electric power, machine building, electronics . . . this is merely one of the many streams filling the rich river of our accomplishments, the economy of the Soviet state created by the great energy of free labor.

The powerful forces channeled into a single objective by the party's Leninist policy are manifested on an unparalleled scale in the solution of socio-economic problems included in and represented by our five-year plans. The book adequately describes the role of these plans in the struggle for strengthening the material and technical base of developed socialism and raising the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people.

This year we shall celebrate the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the implementation of the First Five-Year Plan. Behind us lie nine historical steps, nine giant steps taken by the Soviet state. Each five-year plan encompasses accomplishments of a truly tremendous significance. This applies to the first five-year plans, when the Soviet people were laying the foundations of the contemporary power of the country under most difficult circumstances, and the post-war five-year plans when the economy wrecked by the war was rebuilt on vast territories within the shortest possible time. Unquestionably, this applies to today, when the material and technical base of communism is being directly created, and when the formulated plans are based on the economic and political power of the developed socialist society.

"In terms of its scale, basic indicators of the development of industry and agriculture, science, and culture, and upsurge of the people's welfare, the

10th Five-Year Plan is a new important stage in the building of communism" (p 27).

These scales could be indeed described as unique. The national income will rise over 25 percent in the course of the five-year plan. The production of electric power will reach a level which seemed fantastic only yesterday--1.38 trillion kilowatt hours. All indicators determining the level of prosperity and culture of the Soviet people will rise impressively. What determines the realistic nature of such achievements? The author describes the nationwide struggle for upgrading the effectiveness and quality of the work, launched on the party's appeal this five-year plan, and the initial results of its implementation. As always, our heroic working class is in the leading ranks of the fighters for the five-year plan. The author finds warm words with which to describe the working people of town and country displaying examples of labor valor and sparing no effort and creative energy in the struggle for achieving new heights in labor productivity and quality. They include the Volgograd turner Anatoliy Legkiy, the Penza milkmaid Mariya Kulikova, the Stavropol' shepherd Vasiliy Rudenko, the Azerbaydzhani teacher Zabrali Samedov, the Altay mechanizer Semen Pyatmitsa, and selection worker Lidiya Pimenova, who developed high-yielding wheat strains for the virgin lands . . . describing these and many other people, the author emphasizes their main similarities: initiative, dedication, and innovational approach to the work.

The author frequently returns to the topic of socialist competition which has become an effective method for energizing the creative efforts of the working people. Embodying Lenin's theory of the competition, the party strives to link it more closely to the most important tasks of its economic policy. The counterplans and higher socialist obligations are of tremendous national significance. Noting the importance of skillful organization of the work and the development of a truly personal approach to public ownership, the author emphasizes that these are the features characterizing to date the work of leading production workers and of millions of Soviet people.

The thought of the leading role of the communist party, rallying within its ranks, together with the leading workers, the best representatives of the kolkhoz peasantry, and the country's people's intelligentsia, runs throughout the book. Infinite loyalty to the interests of the people and the greatest possible purposefulness in the struggle for communist ideas, revolutionism and innovation, a principled approach to the assessment of events and individual activities, and unity of words and actions are the outstanding features of our Leninist party, the author points out. That is why the people believe in their party and implement its plans with tremendous enthusiasm.

There are no easy or tried roads in building a new world. The materials in the collection show clearly and convincingly that however great our achievements in developing the national economy and culture, and in upgrading

the people's prosperity may be, they should not create complacency and placidity. The tasks facing us mandatorily call for improving the party's organizational, political, and ideological-educational work, the planning system and practice, and our entire economic mechanism, as well as the more extensive development of socialist competition. The author clearly depicts the basic components for success tested after many years of practical party work. "Again and again we must study acquired experience. We must find and strengthen everything positive and use all internal reserves and possibilities. We must adamantly eliminate shortcomings which, unfortunately, still abound in a number of sectors of economic and cultural construction" (p 31).

It is precisely from this viewpoint that the author considers and analyzes problems related to the theory and practice of the party's solution of the basic problems of the further development of agriculture.

Taking into consideration the objective requirements governing the development of the Soviet society, the CPSU comprehensively elaborated and theoretically substantiated the most important concepts of its agrarian policy at the present stage as an inseparable component of the overall political course. The development of agriculture is considered a task of the whole people, organically linked with the entire socialist economy. The party's present policy in the countryside, the author notes, represents the creative development of the Leninist agrarian theory under new historical conditions. It extensively reflects Lenin's idea of unity in the development of production forces and socio-economic relations.

Emphasizing the strictly scientific nature of the party's stipulations in the field of agriculture, and the comprehensive approach to the solution of related production-technical, economic, and socio-political problems, the author repeatedly refers to the March 1965 party Central Committee Plenum. He notes in his articles "The 10th Anniversary of the Historical Plenum," "The Leninist Agrarian Policy and its Implementation in the USSR," and "CPSU Agrarian Policy in the Period of Developed Socialism," as well as in many reports and speeches, the author notes the tremendous historical significance of this plenum which marked a sharp turn in agricultural management and had a decisive influence on the entire subsequent socio-economic progress in the countryside and which contributed to the further development of the entire socialist economy.

"The party stipulated," the author writes, "that the problem of the accelerated upsurge of agriculture is not simply an economic matter but a major political, party-wide and state-wide task" (p 49). The author shows thoroughly and comprehensively the way this political line, further developed and consolidated at the 23rd, 24th, and 25th Party Congresses, and at the May 1966, October 1968, and July 1970 Central Committee Plenums, is being implemented in practical actions step by step: in the economic stimulation of agricultural production and its technical retooling, mechanization, reclamation, and chemization.

Priority was given to the intensive factor without which one can no longer hope to achieve any significant success in the development of crop growing and animal husbandry. Above all, measures were taken to surmount difficulties created in the past by management shortcomings, and underrating the economic laws of socialism and the principles of material incentive of the rural workers. The considerable broadening of the economic independence of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the strengthening of cost accounting relations, the new stable procurements system, and increased material and moral rewards for labor successes radically changed circumstances in the villages, giving the people confidence in their work, and triggering their creative initiative.

A truly tremendous amount of work was done, as the examples cited in the collection show, in the technical refitting of the villages and the creation of a material and technical base consistent with modern requirements. One of the determining reasons for the slowdown in the pace of development of agricultural production, as disclosed at the March 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, was the fact that agriculture was faced with major tasks not supported, however, with the necessary economic measures and required capital investments. Already in the first decade which followed the plenum, socialist industry supplied the countryside with three million tractors, 1.6 million trucks and specialized motor vehicles, 906,000 grain combines, and other agricultural machinery worth 23 million rubles (see p 52).

The equipment itself changed qualitatively. Highly productive K-700 tractors with their modified models, Kolos, Niva, and Sibiryak grain combines, self-propelling six-row beet harvesters, and other types of modern machinery were sent to the fields. Systematic conversion from partial to comprehensive production mechanization was undertaken.

The scale of accomplishments in agricultural chemization and land reclamation is no less impressive. Compared with 1964, in 1975 chemical fertilizers supplied to agriculture had more than tripled. Over 13 million hectares of new irrigated and drained land were put into circulation. The Soviet people described the implementation of the vast complex program for the development of agriculture in the Nonchernozem zone of the RSFSR as a second virgin land program. All this shows the volume and pace of a project unmatched anywhere else in the world.

Problems of improving the forms of organization of agricultural production and, above all, its further specialization and concentration, using industrial methods and making extensive use of science and technology, expanding inter-farm cooperation and agro-industrial integration, are extensively discussed in the collection. Today this is one of the main directions of the CPSU's agrarian policy. The creation and extensive development of big specialized inter-farm enterprises and associations marks a new stage in the socialist socialization of output in agriculture.

The author describes extensively the comprehensive nature of the specialization process. Today it is manifested in the division of labor among natural-economic rayons, the building of state enterprises for the production of crop growing and animal husbandry goods on an industrial basis, increased farm specialization, and establishment of cost accounting farm subdivisions. Today, however, the author points out, specialization and concentration, based on inter-farm cooperation and agro-industrial integration, are two of the most important of them. This is precisely the path, as practical experience has indicated, that enables all kolkhozes and sovkhozes to benefit from the advantages of specialized output. This is our party's further development of the Leninist theory of cooperation and its creative application in the building of communism.

Substantiating the advantages of and possibilities for specialization, concentration, and inter-farm rural cooperation with numerous examples and, specifically, the experience of the Moldavian SSR, Krasnodarskiy Kray, and Penzenskaya, Khar'kovskaya, Voronezhskaya, and many other oblasts, the author also emphasizes the need to conduct such work on the basis of total scientific elaborations and in accordance with the specific conditions prevailing in each enterprise and zone. Here lagging, haste, rushing ahead, and hasty decisions are equally inadmissible. The author substantively criticizes the gigantomania displayed in a number of areas and the attraction for setting up huge cattle complexes totally unrelated to the fodder space and neglecting all veterinary, sanitation and economic requirements.

The practice of some rayons and farms, as was confirmed, in particular, at the Tambovskaya Oblast Party Committee Plenum, held last March, indicates that this warning is just as topical today. Thus, errors and omissions in specialization have led here to the fact that some of the extensive animal husbandry complexes built in the area are not operating at full capacity and are inefficient because of the lack of the necessary amount of cattle and fodder, and the shortage of skilled cadres.

Many other topical agricultural production problems are profoundly and comprehensively analyzed in the collection. They include, for example, the problem of equalizing the economic conditions determining the development of farms having different possibilities, improving purchase prices in accordance with natural-economic factors, relations between kolkhozes and sovkhozes and enterprises, and organizing their service industry. The author notes the importance of formulating a criterion for agricultural production capital returns and effectiveness, the elaboration of new progressive technologies in crop growing and animal husbandry, and the practical utilization of the latest scientific and technical achievements in these sectors. Great attention is paid to the creation of the necessary conditions for the total preservation of the crops and the prompt processing and taking the produce to the consumer--problems whose importance was re-emphasized by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the course of his trip in Siberia and the Far East.

The author discusses extensively one of the decisive problems--the training and raising of rural cadres. He points out that the party has done a tremendous deal of work in bringing up cadres and enhancing their political activeness and skills. An efficient system for training and upgrading the skills of cadres at all rural production and management levels has been established in the country. However, as in any other matter, it is important in cadre work promptly to find out bottlenecks and resolve problems with an eye to the future. At the present stage intensifying the work with middle-level cadres and fully supplying the kolkhozes, sovkhozes and inter-farm enterprises with mechanizers and skilled workers in other mass professions is such a task.

Substantiating the importance of the successful solution of cadre problems the author relies on specific experience--in this case on the Rostov experience--which was positively rated in the CPSU Central Committee decree, "On the Work of the Rostovskaya Oblast Party Committee on Strengthening Agriculture with Middle-Level Cadres, Mechanizers, and Other Mass Skills." This involves paying constant attention to work with cadres by the party organizations, supporting the initiative and authority of specialists, and promptly training cadre reserves. Each rayon in the oblast, and each kolkhoze and sovkhoze, has its efficient long-term plan for the selection, placement, and upgrading the skills of middle-level personnel. All this, in the final account, brings success.

The author directly links the acute and vitally important rural problems of training and retaining cadres, young people in particular, to the creation of good working and living conditions and to displaying a responsiveness and attention to the growing generation. Here as well, as in the solution of other problems, he particularly emphasizes the role of rural party raykoms, primary party organizations, and kolkhoze and sovkhoze party members. A specific, realistic, and comprehensive approach to the solution of economic, social, political, and ideological problems, imbued with concern for the general interests of the party and the people, has become determining in their work style and methods. However, this should not lead to the conclusion that there are no shortcomings in the practice of the party's economic management. "We must continue adamantly to improve organizational and political work and promote the Leninist style of economic management at all levels of the economic and state apparatus. We must raise cadres in a spirit of high party conscientiousness and responsibility for the implementation of party and government directives. We must promote initiative and efficiency in the work. We must boldly expose shortcomings and eliminate anything which hinders our successful progress" (p 334).

The author pays particular attention to the social development of the countryside, considered by the party as the most important component of its agrarian policy. This is natural. "... The question of the way of life of the tremendous population majority--the peasant population--is a basic question for us," Lenin noted in the first years of socialist reorganization ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 248). Following Lenin's bequest the party

earmarked realistic measures aimed at upgrading the living and cultural standards of the rural workers. After the March Central Committee Plenum, kolkhoze wages rose considerably and pensions and social insurance benefits were improved. Consumer construction (in the ten years after the plenum one out of three families moved into new premises and the per capita amount of consumer services rose six times), electrification, and gassification of settlements, water supplies, and road construction developed extensively. The profound changes in the social structure of the rural population and in the nature and content of agricultural work became an effective factor in the rapprochement between town and country in all economic and cultural realms. Let us consider the fact alone that already almost 3/5 of people employed in agriculture are with higher or secondary (full or partial) education. The fast growth of sales in the villages of durable goods such as radio and television sets, pianos, refrigerators, motorcycles, and motor vehicles proves the steady improvement of the prosperity of kolkhoze members and sovkhoe workers and the development of their spiritual needs. The average rural family subscribes to four different newspapers and periodicals. To an ever-greater extent the villages are turning into comfortable settlements which have, as the cities, everything needed for productive toil and cultural recreation such as movies, cultural clubs, and music schools. Naturally, this cannot fail to affect the mentality of the peasant and his social aspect. Characteristic of the working people in the Soviet village are collectivism, a feeling of social duty, and labor and political activity.

The increased level of production socialization and intensified process of cooperativization are actively influencing the nature and organization of labor and creating more favorable conditions for the shaping of communist social relations and the all-round development of the individual.

The problems discussed by the author in studying the experience and tasks in the development of agriculture are broad and many-faceted. All of them are organically related to the reaching of the main objectives discussed at the 25th CPSU Congress: achieving the reliable supply of the country with foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials and always keep adequate reserves for such purposes; continue to increase the similarity between material and cultural-living conditions in town and country, which is our programmatic requirement.

Speeches on CPSU foreign political activities account for an extensive part of the varied topics included in the collection. The pivotal line in such materials is the thought that socialism and peace on earth are indivisible and of the inexhaustible power of the ideas of socialist humanism and proletarian internationalism. The building of communism in the USSR cannot be separated from the world's revolutionary process or the struggle for peace and social progress. This is clearly manifested in all international activities of our party and its foreign political course aimed at ensuring favorable conditions for the building of socialism and communism,

strengthening the unity and solidarity among socialist countries, and achieving a lasting peace and security.

From the first days of the Soviet system, when Lenin's Decree on Peace was adopted, our party and state have firmly opposed war and aggression and favored the social and national liberation of the peoples. The Soviet Union has pursued this Leninist policy firmly and consistently throughout its entire history. Its contemporary expression, the author emphasizes, is the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples, adopted at the 25th CPSU Congress.

The close friendship and all-round interaction among fraternal countries are powerful boosters of socialist progress. Taking as an example the fruitful economic cooperation among CEMA-member countries, which are coordinating their national economic plans and have jointly elaborated and are implementing long-term target programs, the author depicts the tremendous constructive possibilities of world socialism. "The political cliques in the anti-communist camp," he says, "have long been predicting a sinister future for socialism. Yet, despite all such exorcisms, the great comity of socialist states is strengthening and developing year after year. Its beneficial impact on the course of world events is growing steadily and ever faster" (p 35).

The topic of our party's and people's solidarity with the world's national-liberation movement and the struggle of the peoples against imperialism and against its policy of dictate and hegemony, is strongly voiced in the book. The author pays great attention to the problems of strengthening the unity of the international communist and workers' movements and of all revolutionary forces of our time.

Discussing our party's pursuit of a course toward strengthening the peace and security of the peoples, F. D. Kulakov points out that as a result of such efforts a number of most complex problems have been resolved, problems which aggravated the circumstances in the world for decades. Good prerequisites have been created for putting an end to the arms race, dangerous to mankind. International relations are being gradually restructured on the principles of trust and common sense. Yet, many difficulties remain on the path to a radical improvement of the world's political climate. The author condemns the statements of foreign political leaders who, for one or another reason, question detente. Some of them claim that detente is ineffective, for it has not substantially changed the structure of international relations. Others claim that detente, allegedly, benefits the socialist countries alone, and favor the cold war as remaining, as in the past, the basis of relations among countries.

"We do not share such views," the author emphasizes. "Furthermore, we firmly reject attempts to build international relations from a position

of strength. Our country is in favor of implementing all principles and agreements adopted at the European conference. The Helsinki spirit should determine to an ever-greater extent relations among countries in Europe and beyond it" (p 378).

The foreign political course of the Soviet Union and all international activities of the party and the state rest on the inviolable foundations laid by the great Lenin. The author clearly expresses this inviolable continuity and the impressive successes achieved in the struggle for strengthening the peace and socialism, resulting from the purposeful efforts of the party, its Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo, and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. With his tireless efforts to promote peace and to strengthen international security, Leonid Il'ich has earned the most profound respect of all Soviet people and of the broadest possible circles in the world.

Some of the typical impressions made by the collection of selected articles and speeches by F. D. Kulakov are their topical nature in the formulation of problems, depth and purposefulness of his studies, and the lively combination of theoretical concepts with practical problems currently resolved by the party and the people. The work is a substantial contribution to the party's collectively elaborated theory and practice of the building of communism. The collection is one of the books which help us to interpret more profoundly the nature of the party's policy at the present stage and resolve more successfully the problems formulated at its 25th Congress.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOCIAL UTOPIA AND THE IDEA OF SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78 pp 121-124

[Review by V. Ignatovskiy of the books "Utopiya i Istoriya" [Utopia and History] by A. I. Volodin. Some problems of the study of pre-Marxian socialism. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 270 pages; and "Ideya Sotsializma" [The Socialist Idea] by Aleksandr Tsipko. Biographic landmarks. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1976, 272 pages]

[Text] The Marxist concept of the history of socialist thinking was molded in the process of the establishment and maturing of Marxism itself. Discussing the appearance and development of socialist ideas, F. Engels pointed out that communism is the "necessary conclusion inevitably stemming from the prerequisites embedded in the common conditions of contemporary civilization" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 1, p 525).

In the different stages of the revolutionary transformation of reality, the Marxists of all generations have invariably turned, again and again, to the treasury of socialist doctrines, finding in it something either not noticed or considered insignificant by their predecessors.

Each Marxist generation has faced specific historical problems based on the specific period of development of the proletarian movement. After the Great October Revolution, when our party headed the process of the socialist reorganization of the country, particular attention was paid to the political views of utopian socialists and their cooperativization ideas. Lenin's plan for the conversion of petty farming to collectivism was based on the idea of the cooperative which he linked, above all, with the plans of the "old cooperativists, starting with Robert Owen" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 375), for "a great deal of what was considered fantastic and even romantic or even trite in the dreams of the old cooperativists is turning into the most unembellished reality" (ibid, p 369).

Our present is noted by the fact that we have reached "the type of stage of maturity of the new society in which the restructuring of the sum total of social relations on the basis of internal collectivistic principles inherent

in socialism is nearing its completion" (L. I. Brezhnev). Priority is given to the critical reinterpretation of the positive program of utopian socialists in the light of the historical experience of existing socialism. Today we are attracted to an ever greater extent by their social philosophy, their theory of man and his behavior, their concept of the associative way of life, the communist way of life, and many other aspects which were brilliantly anticipated by the great utopians.

In this connection the question of the meaningful ties between the positive aspects of the theories of utopian socialists in the pre-Marxian epoch and Marx's and Engels' theories of scientific socialism is becoming very interesting. It is the question of what is, so to say, the core of the socialist theories of the past and the present. Unquestionably, a search for their socialist criteria is the most important among a number of methodological problems.

The books under review by A. I. Volodin and A. S. Tsipko discuss primarily and precisely this problem. Naturally, each of the authors has chosen his own way for compacting its analysis.

A. I. Volodin considers the problem on a broad historical level. He deems it important, on the one hand, to define the nature, the essence of utopian socialism as a specific form of social thinking, and to clarify its distinction not only from scientific socialism but from various other social theories of a utopian or non-utopian nature, frequently very close to utopical socialism logically and historically, yet, nevertheless, not socialist in the strict meaning of the term. A. I. Volodin attempts to prove that the very progress within utopian socialism, from the viewpoint of its theoretical substantiation, brought it ever more closely to reality and to the revelation of its truly socialist content.

A. S. Tsipko formulates the problem of the socialist criterion more narrowly and, therefore, more concretely. He links its solution to the search for a meaningful, theoretical, and conceptual, continuity between the utopian socialism of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, on the one hand, and the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels, on the other. The author breaks down and logically systematizes in the theories of these utopians their starting conceptual ideas which give us the right to consider them socialist. The author makes yet another attempt to explain why Marx and Engels described precisely Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, rather than other philosophers, as the "patriarchs of socialism," and consider the three philosophers as the real "founders" of contemporary socialism.

The books are reciprocally complementary, clarifying a broad range of methodological problems arising in connection with the study of pre-Marxian socialism: What is utopian socialism, and what are its nature and development in historical forms; methods for substantiating the ideal of the future; ideological continuity between utopian and scientific socialism, and the humanistic nature of Marxism.

In A. I. Volodin's book the starting point for the study of problems of the socialist criterion is the analysis of the interpretations of the concepts of utopian socialism according to which all theories reflecting the "ideal of common property" is reflected. He considers the various viewpoints concerning the essence and very nature of utopian socialism and criticizes the view that its elements developed in antiquity and were further developed in the social doctrines of early Christianity and the heresies of the various sects which appeared in the Middle Ages. A. I. Volodin considers as the first and main characteristic of the criterion in assessing the various social theories a sign of class affiliation. Throughout the history of antagonistic societies socialism in the broad meaning of the term was the reflection of the popular objection to oppression and inequality. In his view, however, such a broad understanding of socialism should be differentiated from the truly socialist theories which were extended on a qualitatively higher level with Marx's and Engels' scientific socialism. (A. S. Tsipko as well points out in his book the shortcoming of this excessively broad definition of socialist theories as anti-exploitation theories.) Utopian socialism, A. I. Volodin writes, could not "be born before the beginning of the very maturing and establishment of bourgeois relations" (p 35). He points out that Engels related the birth of socialism as a "new doctrine" only to the epoch of the struggle of the bourgeoisie against feudalism, the epoch of "big bourgeois movements." for this reason, in a more concrete, more special interpretation of the concept, the fathers of utopian socialism are the philosophers "who were the first to reflect in their works a protest precisely directed against the capitalist forms of exploitation of the working people, however underdeveloped such forms might have been" (p 36).

In this connection, utopian socialism arises above all as a demand on the part of the pre-proletariat to intensify the bourgeois revolution. Whereas the doctrine formulated by Thomas Munzer was the first "brilliant anticipation" of the aspirations of the future pre-proletariat, the idea of an ideal society was expressed by Gerrard Winstanley as the natural consequence of occurring socioeconomic and political processes. The idea of the reorganization of private property as the main source of all difficulties and troubles, leading to its total elimination, and the idea of intensifying the revolution as the only way to a new and truly just society acquired its clearest aspect in Babeuf's theory. That is why, according to A. I. Volodin, "Gerrard Winstanley and, to an ever greater extent, Gracchus Babeuf" could be considered as the founders of strictly socialist philosophy (p 58).

Elsewhere the author notes that "it was precisely Babouvism that established the line beyond which socialism begins" (p 56). The social-utopian anti-exploitation ideas which predeceased Winstanley and Babeuf, and the dreams and expectations of the working people were, according to the author of "Utopiya i Istoriya" merely the pre-history of utopian socialism (see p 60).

Considering the appearance of utopian socialism above all in connection with the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, A. I. Volodin believes that the main points of development of utopian socialism, in the strict meaning of

the term, coincide with turning points, landmarks, and "junctions" of universal history such as, for example, the revolutions of 1640-1660, 1789-1794, 1830, and 1848-1849.

In the theories of utopian socialism, the author specifies, the social criticism of capitalism was expressed in two forms. It was "hindsight" criticism, from the positions of yesterday, a negative criticism deprived of a positive program, a criticism consisting of pitting the unpleasant present to the idealized past, and "foresight" criticism from the positions of the future, a criticism with a constructive nature. Hence, the author's conclusion that the extent of the socialist nature of one or another theory is determined not only by the level of rejection of capitalist practices but the extent to which such a theory would come close to the realization of the fact that socialism is impossible without the use of technological and cultural gains reached by big capitalism.

Exposing the limited and immature nature of Babeuf's utopian socialism, the author proves why scientific socialism was based not on this utopia but on the social doctrines promoted by Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen.

As to Saint-Simon, A. I. Volodin writes, "what makes him the patriarch of socialism is, obviously, not the idea of public ownership of capital goods (which he did not have, thus showing a certain inconsistency and "unfinished nature" of his socialism) but, above all, his acknowledgment of the limited nature of the accomplished bourgeois revolution--the "horrible yet beneficial crisis in terms of its results"--and the sharp criticism of "young" capitalism, from the viewpoint of the ideal of a society in which there would be no division into working people and exploiters . . . and in which an association would be organized in which common interest will unite all people" (p 85).

In the second part of the book the author offers a classification of the types of pre-Marxist socialism based on the method used in substantiating the ideal future society. He traces the various levels of social realism in the doctrines of the socialists of the past, "the intensive search for laws governing the progress of mankind to the future just society" (p 142).

Unlike A. I. Volodin, A. S. Tsipko emphasizes that Marx and Engels did not consider Babeuf and his followers as their predecessors. He justifiably points out that Marx and Engels criticized not only the French equalitarians of the 1830's and 1840's but Babeuf himself and his positive program.

A. S. Tsipko expresses the assumption that Marx and Engels could not acknowledge Babeuf as a socialist not only because they found his doctrine theoretically undeveloped but also because they were repelled by his lack of attention to the personal, the human aspect of the problem, and by his inability to understand it.

Like A. I. Volodin, A. S. Tsipko also believes that from the scientific viewpoint it would be expedient to make a distinction between utopian socialism of pre-capitalist epochs and utopian socialism in the strict meaning of the term, coming very close to Marx's and Engels' scientific socialism and constituting its predecessor. According to the author, however, in itself the aspiration of one or another philosopher to surmount the limited nature of the social reforms brought about by the bourgeois revolution and his desire to exceed the limits of bourgeois changes and defend the interests of the proletariat or the pre-proletariat could not be used by itself as a criterion of socialism.

The criterion of socialism, writes A. S. Tsipko, should be sought in the factual humanism of one or another doctrine and the ability of its author to transfer humanism from the field of speculative judgments to that of political solutions, deriving from the idea of equality the need to free the proletariat from want and exploitation. The revolutionary criticism of capitalist order must be linked with not simply the idea of equality, for all people could be absolutely equal in their misfortune, but the ideal of an equally happy life led by free and comprehensively developed people. The author refers to Engels' thought that socialism, in the strict meaning of the term, "appeared only when machines and other inventions gave all members of society the possibility for all-round education and a happy existence" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 42, p 358).

"The constructive criticism of capitalism and the bourgeois revolution," writes A. S. Tsipko, "is a criticism leading to the acknowledgment of the need for a 'restructuring' of that society, acknowledging the need for the creation of a social organization which could radically change the existing state of things and resolve the problem of man, being the common conceptual platform which, on the one hand, would rally different philosophers such as Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, and, on the other, bring together the great utopians and the founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels" (pp 91-92).

The author of "Ideya Sotsializma" draws the attention to the fact that Marx equated "completed humanism" with communism. "It is noteworthy," A. S. Tsipko points out, "that it was precisely the term 'real humanism' that was used by Marx and Engels in their first joint work 'The Holy Family' to define their outlook" (p 69).

Emphasizing a humanist orientation as the basic criterion of socialism, the author tries to depict, on the one hand, the nature of the conceptual continuity between the utopias of the "patriarchs of socialism," Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, and Marx's and Engels' scientific socialism, on the other, and the qualitative distinction between the socialist theories of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, and the various types of grossly equalitarian communist theories. Furthermore, citing Academician V. P. Volgin, A. S. Tsipko points out that this criterion must be used in specific historical terms. " . . . As real humanism, socialism changed from one

century to another, both in terms of form and content" (p.70). The humanism of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen was different from Moore's humanism, while Marxism, as real humanism, is immeasurably more consistent and more revolutionary than the humanism of the "patriarchs of socialism."

According to A. S. Tsipko the idea of a free association of socialists-utopians had a decisive influence on shaping the Marxist concept of the future. "Before Fourier, Owen, and Saint-Simon," the author writes, "social thinking reached essentially two extremes: Either defense of individualism taken so far as to justify immorality as one of the manifestations of individualism, defense of collectivism which in the final account, leads to acknowledging the expediency of despotism as a means to fight individualism. The 'patriarchs of socialism,' Fourier and Owen in particular, tried to create the type of collective society which would dialectically combine the interests of the individual and the collective without despotism or the subversion of the individual, a society which could preserve individualism."

In his concluding chapters A. S. Tsipko paid great attention to the study of the qualitative differences between utopian socialism and the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels, and between the formulation of problems based on various types of abstract principles and the scientific substantiation of the laws governing the historical change.

Making a detailed comparative analysis of the views of the great utopians, and comparing their brilliant "guesses" with the concepts expressed by Marx and Engels, the authors of both books convincingly prove that Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen were indeed the founders of a new social doctrine which was the predecessor of scientific socialism.

Yet, in our view, the authors' concepts are not always consistent and, therefore, free from shortcomings. For example, we question A. I. Volodin's use of an initial methodological principle of Lenin's criticism of populism in the study of the ideas of the simplistic equalizers. In this case he violates the principle of historicism in studying the development of social utopian thinking. Occasionally, the impression arises that the author reduces his search for indications of the socialist nature of utopian theories essentially to the search for the elements of scientific socialism in the pre-Marxian epoch. This leads to upgrading the research topic. That is probably A. I. Volodin fails to formulate a unified logic foundation in defining the socialist criterion. He is not always successful in tracing the internal continuity in the involvement of socialist thinking in the pre-Marxian epoch.

In our view, this leads the author to a "historical paradox," according to which the first representatives of socialism, "its originators (the most important among them . . . Babeuf) were also representatives of equalitarian communism which contradicts the very nature of the socialist ideals" (p. 137). Apparently, here it is a question not of a "real historical paradox" but simply of an insufficient coordination (within the framework of the concepts formulated by A. I. Volodin) between the historical and logical approaches to the study of the socialist criterion. The question also consists of establishing the hierarchy of subordination of the characteristics of this criterion.

A certain lack of clarity may be detected in A. S. Tsipko's book. Initially, the author sets as the cornerstone of his conceptual criterion the closeness between the humanism of the "patriarchs" and Marx's and Engels' real humanism. Subsequently, he analyzes less the conceptual and ideological contact than the scientific tools of the theories of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, paying every greater attention to their guesses and brilliant discoveries, leaving in the background the humanistic nature of these theories.

In our view, the author engages in an excessive actualization in his studies of the "great utopians." Moved by the desire to bring them as close to the practice of existing socialism as possible, the author is carried away and pits quite sharply the ideas of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen against the utopian communism of Mably, Morelli, and Babeuf. Naturally, a continuity did exist in this case, and should not be underestimated.

Regardless of these shortcomings, we are convinced that the attempt of these authors formulate and resolve the problem of the socialist nature of pre-Marxian utopian socialism is noteworthy. The philosophical view of the history of socialist doctrines, characteristic of the works of A. I. Volodin and A. S. Tsipko, has unquestionably helped them to formulate and consider a number of meaningful problems of development of socialist thinking. And, above all, the problem of the ideological connection between the theories of "founders of socialism," the utopians Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen, and the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels. Also of great interest in the study of the methodological and conceptual foundations of the Marxist-Leninist criticism of simplistic equalitarian communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

UNITED STATES IN THE MODERN WORLD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 78, pp 124-128

[Review by A. Mileykovskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, and V. Trukhanovskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the books "SShA: Gosudarstvo i Ekonomika" [United States: State and Economics]. Editors in chief Yu. I. Bobrakov, and V. A. Fedorovich. Nauka, Moscow, 1976, 590 pp. "SShA: Vneshneekonomicheskaya Strategiya" [United States: Foreign Economic Strategy]. Editor in chief M. I. Zakhmatov. Nauka, Moscow, 1976, 496 pp. "SShA: Politika, Voyna, Ideologiya" [United States: Politics, War, Ideology] by G. A. Trofimenko. Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 359 pp]

[Text] By virtue of a number of objective factors relations between the USSR and the United States assume one of the most important places in contemporary international relations. This is explained by their role and position in the world's system of states, and their economic and military power. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev justifiably pointed out in his message to the visitors to the Soviet national exhibit in Los Angeles, "The preservation of international peace largely depends on the condition of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States." This makes understandable the interest in the study of American affairs in our country. The fruitful activities of our scientists in this field are confirmed by the publication of a number of profound monographic studies of various problems of American history and contemporary condition of the U.S. economy and politics, as well as the extensive acknowledgment of the achievements of Soviet students of American affairs abroad, including in the United States.

Of late the attention of the readers has been drawn to works published by the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, describing the main capitalist country in the three dimensions, so to say, which determine its position in the contemporary world.

The first is the anatomical study of the U.S. state-monopoly economy and the mechanisms through which it is influenced by the state. The peculiarity

of the United States is that in terms of the share of foreign trade in its economy it is behind its partners and rivals--the Western European countries and Japan. The U.S. economy relies mostly on the utilization of its internal resources and the solvent demand of its domestic market. Despite this, however, its influence on the world's capitalist economy rose tremendously in the post-war period. This is explained in detail in the second book. After World War II, more than ever before, the foreign economic strategy of the United States has been based on capital exports. The foreign branches of U.S. monopolies produce industrial commodities whose value is nearly five times higher than the volume of exports of goods manufactured by domestic enterprises. The U.S. monopolies, which are the main nucleus of the multi-national corporations, have become the most important strongholds of U.S. imperialist strategy. The third book describes the foreign economic components of the aggressive policy of American imperialism. After World War II it assumed the function of "world policeman" and organizer of the cold war. In peacetimes it not only developed the arms race in its own country but comprehensively encouraged it in the other capitalist countries it involved in military blocs.

The interrelated logic of these three works enables the readers to see in detail why the United States is the epicenter of economic and political crises shaking up the capitalist world and intensifying the general crisis of capitalism manifested in the narrow area of domination of imperialism now retreating under the pressure of the world's revolutionary forces.

The book "SShA: Gosudarstvo i Ekonomika" considers in detail the almost entire essential arsenal of instruments for governmental control of the economy: budgetary levers and the instruments of the fiscal-credit policy, the system of state organs participating in the shaping and implementation of the basic economic decisions of the government, the federal reserve system, the system of federal contracts, and the systems of regional economic and infrastructural control, and state economic forecasting and programming. Unfortunately, the book does not have a chapter on the characteristics of the production base of the state sector. Even though in the country of the most powerful corporations in the capitalist world the state sector plays a relatively minor role, nevertheless, the consideration of this problem, unquestionably, would have been useful to clarify the specifics of the state-monopoly mechanism.

The study provided by the authors of the legal foundations of the contemporary system of state economic control organs and of the basic stages of its shaping and its occurring changes is useful. The authors legitimately emphasize the increased role of the president's economic organs formulating the principles of economic policy and coordinating the activities of other departments. The facts cited in the book indicate that the economic policy of the government, aimed at stimulating the technical retooling of key industrial branches, contributed to the aggravation of reproduction contradictions which predetermined the development of the 1974-75 crisis. The

tool used in this policy was that of tax benefits to big business, which raised the volume of its internal accumulations sources. Meanwhile, the steady rise in income tax took place reducing the solvent demand of the working people.

The materials cited in the book enable us to judge of the stage-entrepreneurial activities based on economic-contractual relations between the state and the private sector, aimed at forcing suppliers to observe the discipline of schedules. However, as the authors point out, the existing system for the management of federal programs is not only unable to surmount the forces of anarchy dominating the U.S. economy, but intensify their effect as a result of its orientation toward strengthening the positions of the military-industrial complex. The authors discuss in detail the range of problems affecting capitalist long-range programming which is a vivid example of the close cooperation between the state and the monopolies, enabling the latter to assess in specific terms possible prospects for the development of their economic empires in accordance with the government's economic policy. Meanwhile, numerous facts prove that economic programming and forecasting as a method for state-monopoly control is unable, in the majority of cases, to counter the effect of spontaneous processes in the U.S. economy.

The study of economic doctrines and strategic concepts of leading bourgeois economists in the United States convincingly proves the objective inevitability of the failure of the estimates of American bourgeois economists and political leaders to the effect that the arsenal of means for state-monopoly control could ensure a stable economy and socio-political life in the United States.

In addition to a description of the basic elements of this strategy, the book "SShA: Vneshneekonomicheskaya Strategiya" offers a study of the methods for foreign economic expansion and the characteristics and forms of capital and commodity exports, and their new "geography." It supplements the already considered work with a detailed description of state-monopoly control abroad, reflecting the growing role of the multinational corporations in the functioning of the entire U.S. economic mechanism.

The rapid involvement of the United States in the international division of labor is being accompanied by a rising aggravation of contradictions within the world's capitalist economy, related to the strengthened positions of the Western European countries and Japan and the weakening of the monopoly of American corporations over the utilization of the raw materials of developing countries. Reliance on the retention of U.S. scientific and technical superiority over the other capitalist countries as well as superiority in the field of production management is an important tool in the foreign economic expansion strategy. However, we believe that, emphasizing the importance of the reasons for the long-term nature of U.S. scientific and technical leadership, the authors have not adequately taken into consideration the changes which have taken place in Western Europe and Japan in terms of the increased share in their national income

of expenditures for scientific research and experimental design. These changes are already now being manifested to a substantial extent in the growing competitiveness of Japanese and West German goods in the domestic market of the United States.

In the course of its foreign economic expansion the United States is turning to an ever-greater extent to capital exports. Through the middle of the 1970's such exports outstripped capital exports of all remaining imperialist countries together. Intensive capital exports played a decisive role in converting U.S. national monopolies into international. It contributed to the strengthened aggressiveness of U.S. foreign economic policy. "The unification of the capitalist countries under U.S. leadership, dictated by the interests of the most influential monopoly capital groups," the authors point out, "was, in the course of the entire post-war period, the general strategic line of U.S. foreign economic policy whose implementation revealed the unity of views shared by both ruling U.S. parties" (p 128).

The authors note the strengthening of state-monopoly control over U.S. foreign economic expansion in the 1970's, characterized by the increased use of state budget funds to finance deliveries based on "aid" programs, the crediting of exports and insuring of export loans, and the granting of subsidies to exporters. The authors also extensively discuss the characteristics marking the U.S. offensive on the markets of the developed capitalist countries.

Data describing the role of international organizations as channels for the implementation of U.S. foreign economic policy have been properly systematized. It is a question of organizations which, to one or another extent, are under U.S. control and which are engaged in aspects of international economic relations such as international financing and trade, capital exports and technical-economic assistance, and the power and food problems. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has been assigned a particular role in the strategy of U.S. foreign economic expansion. The authors consider the means for the utilization of this organization in the interests of American foreign economic policy. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) plays an important role. It was precisely to it that the United States turned at the beginning of the 1970's with a view to safeguarding its privileged status in the international monetary system, shifting to its partners the burden of finding a solution to the monetary crisis and using this fund as a channel for maneuvers in its relations with the developing countries. The authors also study the role of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and of regional development banks.

G. A. Trofimenko's work provides a historical analysis of U.S. military-political strategy. Using the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on problems of war and peace, and their study of the characteristics of

American capitalism and the American bourgeois state at its different development stages, the author describes and sums up the basic postulates of U.S. bourgeois military thinking, showing the "constants" in the military-political strategy of the American ruling classes, which have retained their importance throughout the entire history of the United States.

The author depicts the bourgeois nature of American military-political strategy formulated by members of the private ownership class which assumed the leadership of the American republic 200 years ago. From its very beginning this U.S. strategy was based on three main postulates: trust in military power as the final and absolute means for settling foreign political disputes; "enlightened egotism," i.e., a pragmatic consideration based on the long-term strategic benefits to the ruling class; and the idea of American "exclusivity," predetermined "from above," and, allegedly, placing the United States in a special position compared with all other countries in the world and requiring the spreading of the American way of life over the rest of the world, including its imposition on other nations by the force of arms. Following this path, in the second half of the 20th century the United States reached the point of actually claiming the role of the main "guardian" of world order, whose objective was the struggle against socialism and progress and the preservation of capitalism.

The author considers in detail the evolution of the "restraining" concept, fashionable in American literature dealing with this topic, always considered by the U.S. imperialist leadership as the desire not to allow any restrictions whatever to the American policy of "border changes," i.e., American expansion. He proves that today as well the concept of the "balance of forces" remains the basic working concept of U.S. strategy. According to it the United States invariably lays the claim to play the role of some kind of world "super-umpire."

Along with foreign political tradition, after World War II the reactionary geopolitical ideas amended by American theoreticians in such a way that, in their view, the United States would become the center of world order, greatly influenced the molding of U.S. strategy after World War II. Relying on the lengthy preservation of the monopoly over a nuclear bomb and on the economic superiority of the United States which had not experienced the catastrophes of the war, the American ruling circles intended to resolve by force and in their favor all international problems. They relied on "throwing back" world socialism and defeating the revolutionary workers and national-liberation movements in the world.

Essentially, in the post-war years no single American president has failed to formulate global-Messianic claims. "The world," said Truman, rattling the atom bomb, "is considering us today as its leader. The inevitable course of events forces us to assume this role." President Kennedy assured his audience that for the sake of "the necessity to fulfill the obligations entrusted by fate in world leadership" the United States was ready "to pay

any price" and assume "any burden." Even though initially pursuing a more realistic policy, nevertheless, President Nixon frequently repeated that the United States "will provide, as before, world leadership . . . in the establishment of a just world order."

However, essentially, such "leadership" and "order" were reduced to military and other interference in the affairs of other countries and to interventions. This would not fail to result in failures in U.S. foreign policy and the steady decline of American prestige throughout the world. The failures and defeats of U.S. policy forced the American leadership to correct its course in the world arena, from time to time, and moderate imperialist appetites.

The attempts of the American ruling circles to adapt to changes in the world arena, characterized by a constant change in the ratio of forces in favor of peace, democracy, and socialism, as well as the steadily weakening positions of imperialism and militarism, were reflected in Washington's changes in military-political strategy. The dynamics of such changes is traced in detail by the author on the basis of extensive documentary data.

In his monograph G. A. Trofimenko convincingly analyzes the new strategic realities which developed at the beginning of the 1970's and which forced the government of the United States to introduce a number of essential changes in its foreign policy and officially to acknowledge that in the contemporary epoch there is no foundation for maintaining relations between the United States and the USSR other than peaceful coexistence. The familiar Soviet-American accords of the 1970's laid, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in the report to the 25th CPSU Congress, "a solid political and legal base for the development of mutually profitable cooperation between the USSR and the United States based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. To a certain extent they reduced the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war."

However, such a development of events did not suit U.S. circles unable to abandon the concept of American Messianism and hegemonism. These circles opposed detente and promoted the extension and intensification of the arms race. They are energizing their harmful activities and are trying, at the same time, to present Washington's foreign political failures, which are the logical consequence of its expansionistic and unrealistic policy, as the results of detente. As the author emphasizes, we must not underestimate the negative influence of such forces on the development of Soviet-American relations and on world politics in general.

A profound analysis and substantive criticism are characteristic of G. A. Trofimenko's monograph. It is the result of a scrupulous study of an extensive range of sources, many of which used for the first time in our country. The clarity of his thoughts and convincingness of the author's views make his summations related to the historical traditions and basic concepts of U.S. military-political strategy particularly convincing.

The books under review are distinguished by one characteristic. Most of their authors are well acquainted with the country they describe not only as scientists dealing with theoretical problems but as practical workers who have had the opportunity to become personally acquainted with the activities of state institutions and American business and with U.S. political leaders. These books not only contain important theoretical summations but are also aimed at providing useful advice to anyone who, one way or another, might participate in the broadening contacts between our country and the United States.

[Editorial Note] On 24 May a practical science conference was held by the editors to discuss topical problems of party-political work and the tasks of the journal in the light of L. I. Brezhnev's works "Malaya Zemlya" and "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth].

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1978.

5003

CSO: 1802

-- END --